

---

---

**ASSESSMENT OF ACCEPTABILITY AND  
USE OF PROJECT STUDY PLANS**

---

---

**TECHNICAL APPENDICES**

VIEWS, OPINIONS, AND/OR FINDINGS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHOR(S) AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED AS AN OFFICIAL DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY POSITION, POLICY, OR DECISION UNLESS SO DESIGNATED BY OTHER OFFICIAL DOCUMENTATION.

**November 1996**

**ASSESSMENT OF ACCEPTABILITY AND  
USE OF PROJECT STUDY PLANS**

**TECHNICAL APPENDICES**

**Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.  
6352 South Hwy 51  
P.O. Box 1316  
Carbondale, IL 62903  
(618) 549-2832**

**November 1996**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A. MAIL SURVEY RESPONSES RAW FREQUENCIES .....	A-1
APPENDIX B. MAIL SURVEY RESPONSES RAW FREQUENCIES DO NOT KNOW AND NOT APPLICABLE RESPONSES EXCLUDED .....	B-1
APPENDIX C. MAIL SURVEY OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES .....	C-1
APPENDIX D. MATRIX OF SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS AMONG SURVEY QUESTIONS .....	D-1
APPENDIX E. MAIL SURVEY RELATIONS BETWEEN NEGATIVE AND POSTIVE ATTITUDES AND SURVEY CHARACTERISTICS ...	E-1
APPENDIX F. TELEPHONE SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES .....	F-1



**APPENDIX A**

**MAIL SURVEY RESPONSES RAW FREQUENCIES**



## Project Study Plans Assessment Survey

---

### Introduction

The Corps of Engineers implemented a project management process in 1988. This process requires districts to develop a Project Study Plan (formerly, Initial Project Management Plan, IPMP) for each feasibility study. The objective of this survey is to gather information on how districts develop Project Study Plans (PSPs), how they view the PSP process, how they use it, how it works for them, and how they would improve it. This information will be used to develop additional guidance and/or other identified improvements in the PSP process.

Please take a few moments to fill out this survey. Your responses are confidential and will be returned to Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd. for analysis.

### General Instructions

- Please answer the survey frankly, from the knowledge of your experiences, beliefs, and attitudes.
  - Mark your answers clearly using pen or pencil. Please write or print legibly.
  - **If you would like to provide additional comments on any of the survey questions, space to do so is provided at the back of the survey.**
  - If you have any questions on the survey, please telephone Jack Kiefer of Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd. at 618-549-2832 (fax 618-529-3188).
  - After you have completed the survey, please refold it along the line indicated on the back page of the survey and tape or staple the pages closed. Then, just drop it in the mail. No return postage is necessary.
  - **Please return completed survey by July 25, 1995.**
-

**A. This section gathers some background information on your experience in the Corps planning process.**

1. What is your current functional element/job responsibility? *See Appendix C*

Division\_\_\_\_\_ Branch\_\_\_\_\_ Section\_\_\_\_\_ Title\_\_\_\_\_ GS\_\_\_\_\_

2. How long have you been in this position? \_\_\_\_\_yrs \_\_\_\_\_months

Minimum: 1 month  
 Maximum: 25 years, 11 months  
 Mean: 7 years, 1 month

N = 177  
 Missing = 3

3. How long have you been involved in the conduct of planning studies (e.g., Recon, Feasibility) with the Corps? \_\_\_\_\_yrs \_\_\_\_\_months

Minimum: 6 month  
 Maximum: 36 years, 7 months  
 Mean: 15 years

N = 174  
 Missing = 6

4. What was your academic discipline (e.g., civil engineering, geography, economics, etc.)? *See Appendix C*

5. How long have you been employed with the Corps? \_\_\_\_\_yrs \_\_\_\_\_months

Minimum: 1 year, 1 month  
 Maximum: 42 years  
 Mean: 20 years, 2 months

N = 177  
 Missing = 3

6. Have many PSPs/IPMPs have you helped develop/review?

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	10	5.6
1 to 2	27	15.2
3 to 5	60	33.7
6 to 10	40	22.5
More than 10	41	23.0
N =	178	
Missing =	2	

6a. Have many PSPs/IPMPs have you helped develop/review in the last 3 years?

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	12	6.8
1 to 2	59	33.3
3 to 5	68	38.4
6 to 10	26	14.7
More than 10	12	6.8
N =	177	
Missing =	3	

7. How many feasibility studies have you helped develop/conduct?

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	10	5.6
1 to 2	15	8.4
3 to 5	40	22.3
6 to 10	34	19.0
More than 10	80	44.7
N =	179	
Missing =	1	

7a. How many feasibility studies have you helped develop/conduct in the last 3 years?

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	14	7.8
1 to 2	56	31.3
3 to 5	61	34.1
6 to 10	32	17.9
More than 10	16	8.9
N =	179	
Missing =	1	

8. What types of training have you received in preparing PSPs/IPMPs? *(Mark all that apply.)*

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>	
No training	76	
Informal instruction by supervisor	46	
Review of other PSPs/IPMPs	113	
As part of a training course	22	
Other		21
Missing =	2	

9. *Most commonly, what role have you played in the development of PSPs/IPMPs?*

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>	
Project manager	23	
Review	41	
Supervisor	45	
Technical support	83	
Study management	37	
Other	0	7
Not applicable	0	
Missing =	9	

9a. *What types of studies did the PSPs/IPMPs concern? (Mark all that apply.)*

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>
Navigation	85
Flood Control	156
Environmental Restoration	66
Coastal and Shoreline Erosion	53
Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction	35
Water Supply	21
Recreation	26
Hydropower	10
Water Quality	8
Other	14
Missing =	2

**B. This section deals with issues related to your experience in developing PSPs/IPMPs. Please agree or disagree with the following statements. If you cannot express an opinion on a particular statement, please mark the “Don’t Know” column. On the other hand, if you feel that a statement is not applicable to you, please mark the “Not Applicable” column.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don’t Know	Not Applicable
10. Headquarter’s staff provide <u>adequate</u> official guidance to develop PSPs/IPMPs.						
Frequency	14	40	75	6	36	7
Percent	7.9	22.5	42.1	3.4	20.2	3.9
N =	178					
Missing	2					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
11. Headquarter's staff provide <u>consistent</u> official guidance to develop PSPs/IPMPs.						
Frequency	14	53	55	3	46	6
Percent	7.9	29.9	31.1	1.7	26.0	3.4
N =	177					
Missing	3					
12. Headquarter's staff provide consistent feedback upon review of PSPs/IPMPs.						
Frequency	13	62	32	4	57	10
Percent	7.3	34.8	18.0	2.2	32.0	5.6
N=	178					
Missing	2					
13. Sufficient time and resources are provided for the preparation of PSPs/IPMPs.						
Frequency	24	57	77	4	13	3
Percent	13.5	32.0	43.3	2.2	7.3	1.7
N =	178					
Missing	2					
14. Additional guidance is needed to help develop PSPs/IPMPs.						
Frequency	15	54	55	26	25	3
Percent	8.4	30.3	30.9	14.6	14.0	1.7
N =	178					
Missing	2					
15. Previously approved PSPS/IPMPs are typically used as a template for developing new PSPs/IPMPs.						
Frequency	2	5	118	38	12	3
Percent	1.1	2.8	66.3	21.3	6.7	1.7
N =	178					
Missing	2					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
16. PSPs/IPMPs are an appropriate place to incorporate district Quality Control Plans.						
Frequency	5	18	94	27	30	3
Percent	2.8	10.2	53.1	15.3	16.9	1.7
N =	177					
Missing	3					
17. Review standards change as new PSPs/IPMPs are submitted.						
Frequency	5	18	83	18	50	4
Percent	2.8	10.1	46.6	10.1	28.1	2.2
N =	178					
Missing	2					
18. Issues raised at the Recon Review Conference can change the work scopes of the PSP/IPMP.						
Frequency	2	1	120	34	19	2
Percent	1.1	0.6	67.4	19.1	10.7	1.1
N =	178					
Missing	2					
19. The part of the PSP/IPMP that pertains to my discipline is developed by the study manager/project manager.						
Frequency	29	52	51	22	3	21
Percent	16.3	29.2	28.7	12.4	1.7	11.8
N =	178					
Missing	2					
20. During the development of the PSP/IPMP, the technical experts for each discipline coordinate their efforts to ensure data required for each discipline are developed in a proper and timely manner.						
Frequency	8	31	109	20	7	1
Percent	4.5	17.6	61.9	11.4	4.0	0.6
N =	176					
Missing	4					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
21. I am always given an opportunity to provide meaningful input into the development of the PSP/IPMP pertaining to work I will be expected to do.						
Frequency	8	26	96	26	3	19
Percent	4.5	14.6	53.9	14.6	1.7	10.7
N =	178					
Missing	2					
22. My review comments and concerns are normally incorporated during the development of the PSP/IPMP.						
Frequency	2	7	120	27	9	13
Percent	1.1	3.9	67.4	15.2	5.1	7.3
N =	178					
Missing	2					
23. I know how to develop that part of the PSP that pertains to my area of expertise.						
Frequency	0.0	10	98	50	4	15
Percent	0.0	5.6	55.4	28.2	2.3	8.5
N =	177					
Missing	3					
24. I develop the task description and budget needs for that part of the PSP that pertains to my area of expertise.						
Frequency	1	13	89	45	1	29
Percent	0.6	7.3	50.0	25.3	0.6	16.3
N =	178					
Missing	2					

25. In the preparation of the PSP/IPMP, who determines the tasks to be accomplished for each technical discipline?

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>
Technical expert for that discipline	73
Study manager	9
Study manager and technical expert	75
Chief of planning	1
Tasks are negotiated among team members	26
Other	10
Missing =	3

26. In the preparation of the PSP/IPMP, who determines the level of effort necessary for each technical discipline?

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>
Technical experts for that discipline	68
Study manager	7
Study manager and technical expert	71
Chief of planning	2
Level of effort is negotiated among team members	29
Other	8
Missing =	7

27. What type(s) of assistance would you prefer to help you prepare PSPs/IPMPs? (*Mark all that apply.*)

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>
More specific guidelines	48
Guidebook of methods to meet guidelines	69
Training course	50
Sample PSP/IPMP	96
Other	19
Do not need assistance	36
Missing =	5

28. Of those parts of the PSP/IPMP that you prepare, which parts do you find to be the easiest?

---

---

*See Appendix C*

---

---

---

---

---

---

29. Of those parts of the PSP/IPMP that you prepare, which parts do you find to be the hardest?

---

---

*See Appendix C*

---

---

---

---

---

---

**C. This section is designed to identify your experiences in using PSPs/IPMPs throughout the feasibility study once they have been completed and approved.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
30. PSPs/IPMPs are followed closely during feasibility studies.						
Frequency	13	57	75	6	18	7
Percent	7.4	32.4	42.6	3.4	10.2	4.0
N =	176					
Missing	4					
31. The PSP/IPMP is used to keep track of the feasibility study schedule/timeline.						
Frequency	7	29	92	14	26	7
Percent	4.0	16.6	52.6	8.0	14.9	4.0
N =	175					
Missing	5					
32. The PSP/IPMP is used to keep track of the cost of the feasibility study.						
Frequency	9	39	74	17	29	7
Percent	5.1	22.3	42.3	9.7	16.6	4.0
N =	175					
Missing	5					
33. Adherence to the PSP/IPMP during the development of the feasibility study reduces the number of revisions to the study during review.						
Frequency	12	61	58	4	34	7
Percent	6.8	34.7	33.0	2.3	19.3	4.0
N =	176					
Missing	4					
34. The PSP/IPMP is used as a reference point for product/report review.						
Frequency	9	36	82	6	37	6
Percent	5.1	20.5	46.6	3.4	21.0	3.4
N =	176					
Missing	4					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
35. PSPs/IPMPs have eliminated the need for work requests.						
Frequency	38	77	8	5	41	7
Percent	21.6	43.8	4.5	2.8	23.3	4.0
N =	176					
Missing	4					
36. Because PSPs/IPMPs make explicit assumptions regarding the conduct of the feasibility study, they make it easier to get changes in the feasibility study approved.						
Frequency	13	56	37	3	61	6
Percent	7.4	31.8	21.0	1.7	34.7	3.4
N =	176					
Missing	4					
37. PSPs/IPMPs are reviewed after the feasibility study in order to identify problems that could occur in future studies (i.e., in order to learn lessons).						
Frequency	25	61	29	1	52	8
Percent	14.2	34.7	16.5	0.6	29.5	4.5
N =	176					
Missing	4					
38. PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>coordination</u> among people assigned to work on feasibility studies.						
Frequency	14	48	80	14	17	6
Percent	8.0	25.6	45.5	8.0	9.7	3.4
N =	176					
Missing	4					
39. PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>communication</u> among people assigned to work on feasibility studies.						
Frequency	12	44	84	10	21	5
Percent	6.8	25.0	47.7	5.7	11.9	2.8
N =	176					
Missing	4					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
40. PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>coordination</u> among sponsors, consultants, and other external organizations that have a role in the feasibility study.						
Frequency	7	21	84	14	43	7
Percent	4.0	11.9	47.7	8.0	24.4	4.0
N =	176					
Missing	4					
41. PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>communication</u> among sponsors, consultants, and other external organizations that have a role in the feasibility study.						
Frequency	8	27	75	10	48	8
Percent	4.5	15.3	42.6	5.7	27.3	4.5
N =	176					
Missing	4					
42. Deviations from the PSP/IPMP are avoided, even when they really should not be.						
Frequency	18	82	30	1	37	6
Percent	10.3	47.1	17.2	0.6	21.3	3.4
N =	174					
Missing	6					
43. The existence of a PSP helps me and/or my District do a better job during the project feasibility stage.						
Frequency	9	31	92	9	27	8
Percent	5.1	17.6	52.3	5.1	15.3	4.5
N =	176					
Missing	4					
44. My district's leadership (i.e., Section Chiefs and Planning Chief) have a positive and supportive view of PSPs/IPMPs						
Frequency	8	25	95	13	31	5
Percent	4.6	13.1	54.3	7.4	17.7	2.9
N =	175					
Missing	5					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
45. The cost of PSPs/IPMPs are offset by savings during the feasibility study process.						
Frequency	19	43	26	4	79	5
Percent	10.8	24.4	14.8	2.3	44.9	2.8
N =	176					
Missing	4					
46. PSPs/IPMPs help identify potential problems that may be encountered in a feasibility study.						
Frequency	5	26	113	17	12	3
Percent	2.8	14.8	64.2	9.7	6.8	1.7
N =	176					
Missing	4					
47. The PSP/IPMP process removes the flexibility that is necessary during the feasibility study.						
Frequency	7	89	42	8	25	4
Percent	4.0	50.9	24.0	4.6	14.3	2.3
N =	175					
Missing	5					
48. PSPs/IPMPs improve coordination among functional elements during the feasibility process.						
Frequency	8	49	83	5	25	6
Percent	4.5	27.8	47.2	2.8	14.2	3.4
N =	176					
Missing	4					
49. Project sponsors are often confused by PSPs/IPMPs.						
Frequency	2	35	47	19	69	4
Percent	1.1	19.9	26.7	10.8	39.2	2.3
N =	176					
Missing	4					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
50. PSPs/IPMPs make <u>districts</u> more accountable for:						
a. Product quality						
Frequency	14	63	57	4	31	3
Percent	8.1	36.6	33.1	2.3	18.0	1.7
N =	172					
Missing	8					
b. Study schedule						
Frequency	6	22	107	17	21	3
Percent	3.4	12.5	60.8	9.7	11.9	1.7
N =	176					
Missing	4					
c. Study budget						
Frequency	6	19	108	18	22	3
Percent	3.4	10.8	61.4	10.2	12.5	1.7
N =	176					
Missing	4					
51. PSPs/IPMPs make <u>team members</u> more accountable for:						
a. Product quality						
Frequency	15	66	60	3	23	3
Percent	8.8	38.8	35.3	1.8	13.5	1.8
N =	170					
Missing	10					
b. Study schedule						
Frequency	7	33	100	15	16	3
Percent	4.0	19.0	57.7	8.6	9.2	1.7
N =	174					
Missing	6					
c. Study budget						
Frequency	7	35	100	13	16	3
Percent	4.0	20.1	57.5	7.5	9.2	1.7
N =	174					
Missing	6					

52. In the development and conduct of the feasibility study, which parts of the PSP/IPMP do you feel are most useful, and why?

---



---



---



---



---



---

53. In the development and conduct of the feasibility study, which parts of the PSP/IPMP do you feel are the least useful or the most constraining, and why?

---



---



---



---



---



---

**D. This section is meant to elicit your attitudes and personal beliefs about the PSP/IPMP process. Therefore, please respond to the following statements frankly by marking one of the columns.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
54. The quality of planning studies has improved with the advent of PSPs/IPMPs.						
Frequency	16	60	51	4	40	3
Percent	9.2	34.5	29.3	2.3	23.0	1.7
N =	174					
Missing	6					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
55. PSPs/IPMPs are a waste of time and/or money.						
a. In my District						
Frequency	17	84	33	13	24	2
Percent	9.8	48.6	19.1	7.5	13.9	1.2
N =	173					
Missing	7					
b. In general						
Frequency	15	84	22	12	38	2
Percent	8.7	48.6	12.7	6.9	22.0	1.2
N =	173					
Missing	7					
56. In the long run, the requirement for a PSP/IPMP saves money.						
Frequency	13	45	55	6	53	2
Percent	7.5	25.9	31.6	3.4	30.5	1.1
N =	174					
Missing	6					
57. There is adequate knowledge of what is required and how to accomplish feasibility studies, without relying on PSPs/IPMPs						
a. In my District						
Frequency	12	56	70	17	14	2
Percent	7.0	32.7	40.9	9.9	8.2	1.2
N =	171					
Missing	9					
b. In general						
Frequency	8	56	52	13	37	2
Percent	4.8	33.3	31.0	7.7	22.0	1.2
N =	168					
Missing	12					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
58. The PSP/IPMP guidance requires too much detail.						
Frequency	5	43	65	28	28	4
Percent	2.9	24.9	37.6	16.2	16.2	2.3
N =	173					
Missing	7					
59. PSPs/IPMPs increase accountability for schedule and budget at the direct expense of product quality.						
Frequency	12	73	45	15	28	2
Percent	6.9	41.7	25.7	8.6	16.0	1.1
N =	175					
Missing	5					
60. The benefits of PSPs/IPMPs will become apparent with more experience.						
Frequency	8	29	81	12	43	2
Percent	4.6	16.6	46.3	6.9	24.6	1.1
N =	175					
Missing	5					
61. PSPs/IPMPs help to keep feasibility studies within the specified budget.						
Frequency	10	38	95	8	21	3
Percent	5.7	21.7	54.3	4.6	12.0	1.7
N =	175					
Missing	5					
62. PSPs/IPMPs help to keep feasibility studies within the specified timeline.						
Frequency	10	38	95	8	21	3
Percent	5.7	21.7	54.3	4.6	12.0	1.7
N =	175					
Missing	5					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
63. The Corps planning process has improved as a result of the requirement for PSPs/IPMPs.						
Frequency	13	41	61	4	53	3
Percent	7.4	23.4	34.9	2.3	30.3	1.7
N =	175					
Missing	5					

**E. This section considers recommendations for changing the PSP/IPMP process and guidance. Please indicate your responses to the following statements and then provide specific recommendations for the PSP/IPMP guidelines.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
64. Preparation of PSPs/IPMPs should occur after approval of the draft reconnaissance report.						
Frequency	2	25	98	23	18	3
Percent	1.2	14.8	58.0	13.6	10.7	1.8
N =	169					
Missing	11					
65. PSPs/IPMPs should be produced in a standard format.						
Frequency	8	38	91	20	15	3
Percent	4.6	21.7	52.0	11.4	8.6	1.7
N =	175					
Missing	5					

66. Who should approve PSPs/IPMPs and why?

---



---



---

*See Appendix C*

---



---

67. Under what conditions should changes in the scope of the PSP/IPMP require approval by Division and/or Headquarters?

\_\_\_\_\_  
*See Appendix C*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

68. The requirement for PSPs/IPMPs should be eliminated.

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	28	19.0
No	119	81.0
N =	147	
Missing =	33	

If yes, why?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*See Appendix C*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

69. What recommendations would you make to modify the current guidelines for PSPs/IPMPs?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*See Appendix C*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

70. Are there any additional comments you would like to make about PSPs/IPMPs and/or the Corps planning process?

---



---

*See Appendix C*

---



---



---



---



---

**F. Telephone Interview**

71. Your responses to the questions and comments above will be combined with other survey responses in order to analyze how the PSP/IPMP process is accepted within the Corps and how it might be improved. We would like the opportunity to speak to you and others in order to clarify your responses. Would you be available for a follow-up telephone interview to discuss the PSP/IPMP process and your survey responses in more detail?

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	81	49.1
No	84	50.9
N =	165	
Missing =	15	

If yes, please provide the following information:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

District: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone number: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax number: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION .**

**Sheet for Comments**

Item#

Comment

—

*See Appendix C*

—

—

—

—

—

**APPENDIX B**

**MAIL SURVEY RESPONSES RAW FREQUENCIES  
DO NOT KNOW AND NOT APPLICABLE RESPONSES EXCLUDED**



**A. This section gathers some background information on your experience in the Corps planning process.**

1. What is your current functional element/job responsibility? *See Appendix C*

Division\_\_\_\_\_ Branch\_\_\_\_\_ Section\_\_\_\_\_ Title\_\_\_\_\_ GS\_\_\_\_\_

2. How long have you been in this position? \_\_\_\_\_yrs \_\_\_\_\_months

Minimum: 1 month  
 Maximum: 25 years, 11 months  
 Mean: 7 years, 1 month

N = 177  
 Missing = 3

3. How long have you been involved in the conduct of planning studies (e.g., Recon, Feasibility) with the Corps? \_\_\_\_\_yrs \_\_\_\_\_months

Minimum: 6 month  
 Maximum: 36 years, 7 months  
 Mean: 15 years

N = 174  
 Missing = 6

4. What was your academic discipline (e.g., civil engineering, geography, economics, etc.)? *See Appendix C*

5. How long have you been employed with the Corps? \_\_\_\_\_yrs \_\_\_\_\_months

Minimum: 1 year, 1 month  
 Maximum: 42 years  
 Mean: 20 years, 2 months

N = 177  
 Missing = 3

6. Have many PSPs/IPMPs have you helped develop/review?

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	10	5.6
1 to 2	27	15.2
3 to 5	60	33.7
6 to 10	40	22.5
More than 10	41	23.0
N =	178	
Missing =	2	

6a. Have many PSPs/IPMPs have you helped develop/review in the last 3 years?

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	12	6.8
1 to 2	59	33.3
3 to 5	68	38.4
6 to 10	26	14.7
More than 10	12	6.8
N =	177	
Missing =	3	

7. How many feasibility studies have you helped develop/conduct?

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	10	5.6
1 to 2	15	8.4
3 to 5	40	22.3
6 to 10	34	19.0
More than 10	80	44.7
N =	179	
Missing =	1	

7a. How many feasibility studies have you helped develop/conduct in the last 3 years?

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	14	7.8
1 to 2	56	31.3
3 to 5	61	34.1
6 to 10	32	17.9
More than 10	16	8.9
N =	179	
Missing =	1	

8. What types of training have you received in preparing PSPs/IPMPs? *(Mark all that apply.)*

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>	
No training	76	
Informal instruction by supervisor	46	
Review of other PSPs/IPMPs	113	
As part of a training course	22	
Other		21
Missing =	2	

9. *Most commonly, what role have you played in the development of PSPs/IPMPs?*

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>	
Project manager	23	
Review	41	
Supervisor	45	
Technical support	83	
Study management	37	
Other	0	7
Not applicable	0	
Missing =	9	

9a. *What types of studies did the PSPs/IPMPs concern? (Mark all that apply.)*

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>
Navigation	85
Flood Control	156
Environmental Restoration	66
Coastal and Shoreline Erosion	53
Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction	35
Water Supply	21
Recreation	26
Hydropower	10
Water Quality	8
Other	14
Missing =	2

**B. This section deals with issues related to your experience in developing PSPs/IPMPs. Please agree or disagree with the following statements. If you cannot express an opinion on a particular statement, please mark the “Don’t Know” column. On the other hand, if you feel that a statement is not applicable to you, please mark the “Not Applicable” column.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10. Headquarter’s staff provide <u>adequate</u> official guidance to develop PSPs/IPMPs.				
Frequency	14	40	75	6
Percent	10.4	29.6	55.6	4.4
N =	135			
Missing =	45			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
11. Headquarter's staff provide <u>consistent</u> official guidance to develop PSPs/IPMPs.				
Frequency	14	53	55	3
Percent	11.2	42.4	44.0	2.4
N =	125			
Missing =	55			
12. Headquarter's staff provide consistent feedback upon review of PSPs/IPMPs.				
Frequency	13	62	32	4
Percent	11.7	55.9	28.8	3.6
N =	111			
Missing =	69			
13. Sufficient time and resources are provided for the preparation of PSPs/IPMPs.				
Frequency	24	57	77	4
Percent	14.8	35.2	47.5	2.5
N =	162			
Missing =	18			
14. Additional guidance is needed to help develop PSPs/IPMPs.				
Frequency	15	54	55	26
Percent	10.0	36.0	36.7	17.3
N =	150			
Missing =	30			
15. Previously approved PSPS/IPMPs are typically used as a template for developing new PSPs/IPMPs.				
Frequency	2	5	118	38
Percent	1.2	3.1	72.4	23.3
N =	163			
Missing =	17			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
16. PSPs/IPMPs are an appropriate place to incorporate district Quality Control Plans.				
Frequency	5	18	94	27
Percent	3.5	12.5	65.3	18.8
N =	144			
Missing =	36			
17. Review standards change as new PSPs/IPMPs are submitted.				
Frequency	5	18	83	18
Percent	4.0	14.5	66.9	14.5
N =	124			
Missing =	56			
18. Issues raised at the Recon Review Conference can change the work scopes of the PSP/IPMP.				
Frequency	2	1	120	34
Percent	1.3	0.6	76.4	21.7
N =	157			
Missing =	23			
19. The part of the PSP/IPMP that pertains to my discipline is developed by the study manager/project manager.				
Frequency	29	52	51	22
Percent	18.8	33.8	33.1	14.3
N =	154			
Missing =	26			
20. During the development of the PSP/IPMP, the technical experts for each discipline coordinate their efforts to ensure data required for each discipline are developed in a proper and timely manner.				
Frequency	8	31	109	20
Percent	4.8	18.5	64.9	11.9
N =	168			
Missing =	12			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
21. I am always given an opportunity to provide meaningful input into the development of the PSP/IPMP pertaining to work I will be expected to do.				
Frequency	8	26	96	26
Percent	5.1	16.7	61.5	16.7
N =	156			
Missing =	24			
22. My review comments and concerns are normally incorporated during the development of the PSP/IPMP.				
Frequency	2	7	120	27
Percent	1.3	4.5	76.9	17.3
N =	156			
Missing =	24			
23. I know how to develop that part of the PSP that pertains to my area of expertise.				
Frequency	0	10	98	50
Percent	0.0	6.3	62.0	31.6
N =	158			
Missing =	22			
24. I develop the task description and budget needs for that part of the PSP that pertains to my area of expertise.				
Frequency	1	13	89	45
Percent	0.7	8.8	60.1	30.4
N =	148			
Missing =	32			

25. In the preparation of the PSP/IPMP, who determines the tasks to be accomplished for each technical discipline?

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>
Technical expert for that discipline	73
Study manager	9
Study manager and technical expert	75
Chief of planning	1
Tasks are negotiated among team members	26
Other	10
Missing =	3

26. In the preparation of the PSP/IPMP, who determines the level of effort necessary for each technical discipline?

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>
Technical experts for that discipline	68
Study manager	7
Study manager and technical expert	71
Chief of planning	2
Level of effort is negotiated among team members	29
Other	8
Missing =	7

27. What type(s) of assistance would you prefer to help you prepare PSPs/IPMPs? (*Mark all that apply.*)

	<u>Number of Times Marked</u>
More specific guidelines	48
Guidebook of methods to meet guidelines	69
Training course	50
Sample PSP/IPMP	96
Other	19
Do not need assistance	36
Missing =	5

28. Of those parts of the PSP/IPMP that you prepare, which parts do you find to be the easiest?

---

---

*See Appendix C*

---

---

---

---

---

29. Of those parts of the PSP/IPMP that you prepare, which parts do you find to be the hardest?

---

---

*See Appendix C*

---

---

---

---

---

**C. This section is designed to identify your experiences in using PSPs/IPMPs throughout the feasibility study once they have been completed and approved.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
30. PSPs/IPMPs are followed closely during feasibility studies.				
Frequency	13	57	75	6
Percent	8.6	37.7	49.7	4.0
N =	151			
Missing =	29			
31. The PSP/IPMP is used to keep track of the feasibility study schedule/timeline.				
Frequency	7	29	92	14
Percent	4.9	20.4	64.8	9.9
N =	142			
Missing =	38			
32. The PSP/IPMP is used to keep track of the cost of the feasibility study.				
Frequency	9	39	74	17
Percent	6.5	28.1	53.2	12.2
N =	139			
Missing =	41			
33. Adherence to the PSP/IPMP during the development of the feasibility study reduces the number of revisions to the study during review.				
Frequency	12	61	58	4
Percent	8.9	45.2	43.0	3.0
N =	135			
Missing =	45			
34. The PSP/IPMP is used as a reference point for product/report review.				
Frequency	9	36	82	6
Percent	6.8	27.1	61.7	4.5
N =	133			
Missing =	47			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
35. PSPs/IPMPs have eliminated the need for work requests.				
Frequency	38	77	8	5
Percent	29.7	60.2	6.2	3.9
N =	128			
Missing =	52			
36. Because PSPs/IPMPs make explicit assumptions regarding the conduct of the feasibility study, they make it easier to get changes in the feasibility study approved.				
Frequency	13	56	37	3
Percent	11.9	51.4	33.9	2.8
N =	109			
Missing =	71			
37. PSPs/IPMPs are reviewed after the feasibility study in order to identify problems that could occur in future studies (i.e., in order to learn lessons).				
Frequency	25	61	29	1
Percent	21.6	52.6	25.0	0.9
N =	116			
Missing =	64			
38. PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>coordination</u> among people assigned to work on feasibility studies.				
Frequency	14	45	80	14
Percent	9.2	29.4	52.3	9.2
N =	153			
Missing =	27			
39. PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>communication</u> among people assigned to work on feasibility studies.				
Frequency	12	44	84	10
Percent	8.0	29.3	56.0	6.7
N =	150			
Missing =	30			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
40. PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>coordination</u> among sponsors, consultants, and other external organizations that have a role in the feasibility study.				
Frequency	7	21	84	14
Percent	5.6	16.7	66.7	11.1
N =	126			
Missing =	54			
41. PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>communication</u> among sponsors, consultants, and other external organizations that have a role in the feasibility study.				
Frequency	8	27	75	10
Percent	6.7	22.5	62.5	8.3
N =	120			
Missing =	60			
42. Deviations from the PSP/IPMP are avoided, even when they really should not be.				
Frequency	18	82	30	1
Percent	13.7	62.6	22.9	0.8
N =	131			
Missing =	49			
43. The existence of a PSP helps me and/or my District do a better job during the project feasibility stage.				
Frequency	9	31	92	9
Percent	6.4	22.0	65.2	6.4
N =	141			
Missing =	39			
44. My district's leadership (i.e., Section Chiefs and Planning Chief) have a positive and supportive view of PSPs/IPMPs				
Frequency	8	23	95	13
Percent	5.8	16.5	68.3	9.4
N =	139			
Missing =	41			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
45. The cost of PSPs/IPMPs are offset by savings during the feasibility study process.				
Frequency	19	43	26	4
Percent	20.7	46.7	28.3	4.3
N =	92			
Missing =	88			
46. PSPs/IPMPs help identify potential problems that may be encountered in a feasibility study.				
Frequency	5	26	113	17
Percent	3.1	16.1	70.2	10.6
N =	161			
Missing =	19			
47. The PSP/IPMP process removes the flexibility that is necessary during the feasibility study.				
Frequency	7	89	42	8
Percent	4.8	61.0	28.8	5.5
N =	146			
Missing =	34			
48. PSPs/IPMPs improve coordination among functional elements during the feasibility process.				
Frequency	8	49	83	5
Percent	5.5	33.8	57.2	3.4
N =	145			
Missing =	35			
49. Project sponsors are often confused by PSPs/IPMPs.				
Frequency	2	35	47	19
Percent	1.9	34.0	45.6	18.4
N =	103			
Missing =	77			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
50. PSPs/IPMPs make <u>districts</u> more accountable for:				
a. Product quality				
Frequency	14	63	57	4
Percent	10.1	45.7	41.3	2.9
N =	138			
Missing =	42			
b. Study schedule				
Frequency	6	22	107	17
Percent	3.9	14.5	70.4	11.2
N =	152			
Missing =	28			
c. Study budget				
Frequency	6	19	108	18
Percent	4.0	12.6	71.5	11.9
N =	151			
Missing =	29			
51. PSPs/IPMPs make <u>team members</u> more accountable for:				
a. Product quality				
Frequency	15	66	60	3
Percent	10.4	45.8	41.7	2.1
N =	144			
Missing =	36			
b. Study schedule				
Frequency	7	33	100	15
Percent	4.5	21.3	64.5	9.7
N =	155			
Missing =	25			
c. Study budget				
Frequency	7	35	100	13
Percent	4.5	22.6	64.5	8.4
N =	155			
Missing =	25			

52. In the development and conduct of the feasibility study, which parts of the PSP/IPMP do you feel are most useful, and why?

---

*See Appendix C*

---



---



---



---



---

53. In the development and conduct of the feasibility study, which parts of the PSP/IPMP do you feel are the least useful or the most constraining, and why?

---

*See Appendix C*

---



---



---



---



---

**D. This section is meant to elicit your attitudes and personal beliefs about the PSP/IPMP process. Therefore, please respond to the following statements frankly by marking one of the columns.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
54. The quality of planning studies has improved with the advent of PSPs/IPMPs.				
Frequency	16	60	51	4
Percent	12.2	45.8	38.9	3.1
N =	131			
Missing =	49			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
55. PSPs/IPMPs are a waste of time and/or money.				
a. In my District				
Frequency	17	84	33	13
Percent	11.6	57.1	22.4	8.8
N =	147			
Missing =	33			
b. In general				
Frequency	15	84	22	12
Percent	11.3	63.2	16.5	9.0
N =	133			
Missing =	47			
56. In the long run, the requirement for a PSP/IPMP saves money.				
Frequency	13	45	55	6
Percent	10.9	37.8	46.2	5.0
N =	119			
Missing =	61			
57. There is adequate knowledge of what is required and how to accomplish feasibility studies, without relying on PSPs/IPMPs				
a. In my District				
Frequency	12	56	70	17
Percent	7.7	36.1	45.2	11.0
N =	155			
Missing =	25			
b. In general				
Frequency	8	56	52	13
Percent	6.2	43.4	40.3	10.1
N =	129			
Missing =	51			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
58. The PSP/IPMP guidance requires too much detail.				
Frequency	5	43	65	28
Percent	3.5	30.5	46.1	19.9
N =	141			
Missing =	39			
59. PSPs/IPMPs increase accountability for schedule and budget at the direct expense of product quality.				
Frequency	12	73	45	15
Percent	8.3	50.3	31.0	10.3
N =	145			
Missing =	35			
60. The benefits of PSPs/IPMPs will become apparent with more experience.				
Frequency	8	29	81	12
Percent	6.2	22.3	62.3	9.2
N =	130			
Missing =	50			
61. PSPs/IPMPs help to keep feasibility studies within the specified budget.				
Frequency	10	38	94	8
Percent	6.7	25.3	62.7	5.3
N =	150			
Missing =	30			
62. PSPs/IPMPs help to keep feasibility studies within the specified timeline.				
Frequency	10	38	95	8
Percent	6.6	25.2	62.9	5.3
N =	151			
Missing =	29			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
63. The Corps planning process has improved as a result of the requirement for PSPs/IPMPs.				
Frequency	13	41	61	4
Percent	10.9	34.5	51.3	3.4
N =	119			
Missing =	61			

**E. This section considers recommendations for changing the PSP/IPMP process and guidance. Please indicate your responses to the following statements and then provide specific recommendations for the PSP/IPMP guidelines.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
64. Preparation of PSPs/IPMPs should occur after approval of the draft reconnaissance report.				
Frequency	2	25	98	23
Percent	1.4	16.9	66.2	15.5
N =	148			
Missing =	32			
65. PSPs/IPMPs should be produced in a standard format.				
Frequency	8	38	91	20
Percent	5.1	24.2	58.0	12.7
N =	157			
Missing =	23			

66. Who should approve PSPs/IPMPs and why?

---



---

*See Appendix C*

---



---



---



---

67. Under what conditions should changes in the scope of the PSP/IPMP require approval by Division and/or Headquarters?

---

---

*See Appendix C*

---

---

---

68. The requirement for PSPs/IPMPs should be eliminated.

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	28	19.0
No	119	81.0
N =	147	
Missing =	33	

If yes, why?

---

---

*See Appendix C*

---

---

---

69. What recommendations would you make to modify the current guidelines for PSPs/IPMPs?

---

---

*See Appendix C*

---

---

---

---

70. Are there any additional comments you would like to make about PSPs/IPMPs and/or the Corps planning process?

---

*See Appendix C*

---

---

---

---

#### F. Telephone Interview

71. Your responses to the questions and comments above will be combined with other survey responses in order to analyze how the PSP/IPMP process is accepted within the Corps and how it might be improved. We would like the opportunity to speak to you and others in order to clarify your responses. Would you be available for a follow-up telephone interview to discuss the PSP/IPMP process and your survey responses in more detail?

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	81	49.1
No	84	50.9
N =	165	
Missing =	15	

If yes, please provide the following information:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

District: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone number: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax number: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION.**

**APPENDIX C**

**MAIL SURVEY OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES**



**1. What is your current functional element/job responsibility/division?**

<u>Division</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Engineering	36	32.7
Planning	36	32.7
Engineering/Planning	13	11.8
Programs and Project management	9	8.2
Real Estate	9	8.2
Chief	3	2.7
Chief, Engineering/Planning	1	0.9
DL	1	0.9
SAC	1	0.9
SWD	1	0.9

N=110

Missing = 70

**1. What is your current functional element/job responsibility/branch?**

<u>Branch</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Plan formulation	15	13.6
Planning	12	10.9
Geotechnical	9	8.1
Design	7	6.4
Cost engineering	6	5.5
Hydraulics and hydrology	6	5.5
Acquisition	5	4.5
Hydraulics	5	4.5
Project management	5	4.5
Civil	3	2.7
Economics	3	2.7
Appraisal	2	1.8
Civil resources	2	1.8
Civil works planning	2	1.8
Cost	2	1.8
Environment	2	1.8
Project reports	2	1.8
Basin	1	0.9
Chief	1	0.9
Civil projects	1	0.9
Civil works	1	0.9
DL-M	1	0.9
EN-C	1	0.9
Engineering	1	0.9
Environmental analysis	1	0.9
Environmental engineering	1	0.9
Environmental resources	1	0.9
Hydrology	1	0.9
M	1	0.9
P	1	0.9
PDF	1	0.9
PDS special studies	1	0.9
Planning environmental	1	0.9
Planning and control	1	0.9
Planning resources	1	0.9
Project development	1	0.9
Real estate	1	0.9
Technical engineering	1	0.9
Water resources	1	0.9

N = 110

Missing = 70

**1. What is your current functional element/job responsibility/section?**

<u>Section</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Plan formulation	7	12.5
Economics	5	8.9
Hydraulic design	4	7.1
Hydraulics	3	5.4
Civil works	2	3.6
Cost engineering	2	3.6
Environmental evaluation	2	3.6
Hydraulics and hydrology	2	3.6
Structures	2	3.6
Alq.	1	1.8
Appraisal	1	1.8
Architecture	1	1.8
Basin-special planning	1	1.8
Chief	1	1.8
Civil project	1	1.8
Coastal	1	1.8
Dams and embankments	1	1.8
Design	1	1.8
Economics plan formulation	1	1.8
Environmental	1	1.8
Environmental studies	1	1.8
Flood control and navigation	1	1.8
Formulation	1	1.8
General water resources	1	1.8
General engineering	1	1.8
HG	1	1.8
Hydraulics, coastal, and FPM	1	1.8
Hydraulic engineering	1	1.8
Hydrology	1	1.8
Levee and drainage	1	1.8
Local projects and recreation	1	1.8
PDFP	1	1.8
Project formulation	1	1.8
Site	1	1.8
Special studies	1	1.8
SWT-PL-A	1	1.8

N = 56

Missing = 124

**1. What is your current functional element/job responsibility/title?**

<u>Title</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Chief	58	38.4
Civil engineering	16	10.6
Study manager	15	9.9
Realty specialist	9	6.0
Project manager	8	5.3
Economist	7	4.6
Hydraulic engineer	7	4.6
Supervisory civil engineer	5	3.3
Appraiser	3	2.0
DDE (PM)	3	2.0
Biologist	2	1.3
Physical scientist	2	1.3
Architect	1	0.7
Community planner	1	0.7
Deputy	1	0.7
Geologist	1	0.7
Geotechnical engineer	1	0.7
I.H.	1	0.7
Outdoor recreation phr.	1	0.7
Plan development and floodplain management	1	0.7
Plan formulation technical specialist	1	0.7
Reg. Environmental	1	0.7
Social science	1	0.7
Structural engineer	1	0.7
Supervisory hydraulic engineering	1	0.7
Supervisory regional economist	1	0.7
Team leader	1	0.7
Technical manager	1	0.7

N = 151

Missing = 29

**1. What is your current functional element/job responsibility/GS level?**

<u>GS</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
12	66	42.9
13	49	31.8
14	18	11.7
11	10	6.5
15	5	3.2
GM - 13	4	2.6
GM - 15	1	0.6
0802	1	0.6

N=154

Missing=26

**4. What was your academic discipline (e.g., civil engineering, geography, economics, etc.)?**

<u>Discipline</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Civil engineering	103	59.5
Economics	18	10.4
Agriculture engineer	5	2.9
Biology	4	2.3
Geology	4	2.3
Architecture	3	1.7
Landscape architecture	3	1.7
Real estate	3	1.7
Aerospace engineer	2	1.2
Engineering	2	1.2
Planning	2	1.2
Agriculture economics	1	0.6
Agriculture, range management	1	0.6
Biological hazardous waste	1	0.6
Biology/chemistry	1	0.6
Biology/toxicology	1	0.6
Business/geography	1	0.6
Business	1	0.6
Business administration	1	0.6
Chemical engineering	1	0.6
Community planning	1	0.6
Education	1	0.6
Environmental	1	0.6
Forestry	1	0.6
Geography	1	0.6
Land surveying	1	0.6
Marine biology	1	0.6
Marine engineering	1	0.6
Mathematics	1	0.6
Petroleum engineering	1	0.6
Psychology	1	0.6
Planning and management	1	0.6
Political science	1	0.6
Recreation planner	1	0.6
Statistics	1	0.6

N = 173

Missing = 7

**8. What types of training have you received in preparing PSPs/IPMPs? ( Mark all that apply)**

As part of a training course (*please specify name of course*)

	<u>Frequency</u>
Project management	16
Blank	2
Corps Elm. Conf.	1
CPM's	1
CW programs and budget course	1
MCACES gold	1
Planner orientation course	1
PM development council	1
Prospect	1
Risk and uncertainty workshop	1
Role in project formulation	1

Other (*please specify*)

	<u>Frequency</u>
Corps guidance	9
Consulting others who developed PSPs	3
In-house training -- group team meetings	3
College courses	2
Planners and project managers program	2
Missing	1
Experience developing PSPs	1
General education	1
IPMPs for hydrologic engineering and economic analysis	1
Peer review	1
Planning division workshop	1

**9. Most commonly, what role have played in the development of PSPs/IPMPs?**

Technical support (*please specify role*)

	<u>Frequency</u>
Real estate	15
Hydraulics and hydrology	14
Economics	9
Geotechnical	9
Cost engineering	7
Environmental	6
Cost estimate	5
Provide input	5
Missing	4
Design	3
Engineering	2
Formulation	1
Policy guidance	1
Supervisor	1
Technical manager	1

Other (*please specify*)

	<u>Frequency</u>
Assistant project manager	1
DDE project manager	1
Division chief	1
Environment compliance information input	1
Executive decisions	1
Project scheduling	1
Study and technical planning manager	1

**9a. What types of studies did the PSPs/IPMPs concern? (Mark all that apply)**

Other (*please specify*)

	<u>Frequency</u>
Dam safety	2
DMMP	2
Missing	2
Aquatic plant control	1
Boat harbors	1
Civil defense	1
Continuing authorities program	1
Emergency/99 projects	1
Environmental infrastructure	1
Fish passage	1
Military land acquisition	1
Scheduling	1
Support for others	1

**25. In the preparation of the PSP/IPMP, who determines the tasks to be accomplished for each technical discipline?**

Tasks are negotiated among team members (*Please specify among whom*)

There are some cross over areas that are assigned as a lead element through negotiations.

Study manager and cost engineer, reallocations and cost engineer, design engineer and cost engineer.

Study manager, chief of planning and technical experts.

It depends on how involved the study is (i.e., sometimes there is not a study manager).

This happens when it's done correctly.

The disciplines that will be tasked with the work.

Study Manager, Technical Manager, and Branch Chief.

All of the above.

Site work, geotechnical, surveying, and H&H make sure all aspects are covered.

Either study manager and plan formulation layout PSP and it is sent for review or technical leaders submit input and then argue.

Study manager, technical manager, and project manager < Chiefs of technical elements.

Developed by technical expert and reviewed by study manager.

All of the above-Chiefs/Technical participants, study managers, and the sponsor.

Study manager and technical experts usually based upon available budget.

Some of the time. Predominant method is team involvement through validity testing of requirements initially specified by technical expert.

Study manager and technical managers.

Econ., Hydr., Design, Real Estate, Surveying, and Environ.

Study manager and various technical experts develop the specific PSP.

Team effort with coordination/input from each team member and study manager.

Study manager and technical expert primarily with some input from local sponsor.

All involved district elements.

*Other (please specify)*

Cost energy has specific tasks that are to be done by cost engineers only.

Project manager/study manager.

It depends. The good ones solicit input from the technical elements. Those who are less experienced don't know where to go for help and generally guess what is needed.

Section chief.

All of the above.

N/A

I don't know.

Local sponsor involved.

Planning technical manager

Don't know.

**26. In the preparation of the PSP/IPMP, who determines the level of effort necessary for each technical discipline?**

Level of effort is negotiated among team members (*Please specify among whom*)

Study manager, chief of planning, and technical experts

Technical experts specify level of effort required. This is typically negotiated with the study manager because of funding.

Technical experts and study manager (usually falls out of time/money ceiling allotted to each discipline by study manager).

Project manger, study manager, technical expert, and our cost-sharing partner.

Study manager and technical manager.

Same as in #25 (the disciplines that will be tasked the work).

Same as in #25 (study manager, technical manager, and branch chief).

All.

Costs drive the effort each area gives and takes.

Technical expert, functional chief, and study manager.

Team discusses level - the problem exists in a Recon on how many plans etc. This also occurs many times in development on feasibility.

Technical expert and study manager.

All team members including the study manger, this insures a consistent level of effort.

Same as in #25 (developed by technical expert and reviewed by study manager).

Same as in #25 (all of the above-chiefs/technical participants, study managers, and the sponsor).

Same as in #25 (study manager and technical managers).

Technical experts and their supervisor.

With all involved district elements.

Other (*please specify*)

Guidance from USACE

Study manager, project manager, and technical.

As in #25 (it depends. The good ones solicit input from the technical elements. Those who are less experienced don't know where to go for help and generally guess what is needed).

Section Chief.

N/A.

I don't know.

Local sponsors involved.

Planning technical manager.

**27. What type(s) of assistance would you prefer to help you prepare PSPs/IPMPs? ( Mark all that apply)**

Other (please specify)

We are the last office to work on the project and planning division sometimes cuts our time short of that needed to prepare a detailed estimate.

Training for technical elements so they understand the importance of the PSP.

More competent study managers (with past experience in technical disciplines, as in engineering private sector).

Having someone around who knows what they're doing.

I and my Branch assist the study managers identify the need for geotechnical investigations ( level of effort, scheduling, and budgeting).

Pamphlets for sponsors explaining process, cost-sharing, w/k, etc.

Recognize the variability of needs.

Clearer rules on levels of effort/technical requirements for environment, real estate, and other non-planning offices.

Discipline specific guidelines.

Consistent outlines.

N/A.

I don't prepare PSP's/IPMP's.

More general guidelines

A standardized format (program) for tasks and computing costs.

Realistic objectives, timeliness, and cost of doing business.

Applicable computer software-Microsoft Project rarely can reflect the technical activity schedules correctly.

Freedom to apply common sense and not the requirement to quantify the marvel on an art.

Advice/assistance from co-worker with experience preparing PSPs/IPMPs.

**28. Of those parts of the PSP/IPMP that you prepare, which parts do you find the easiest?**

	<u>Frequency</u>
Scope of studies	39
Responsibility	1
Schedule	16
Measures of progress and quality	0
Baseline feasibility study cost estimate	32
Procedure and criteria	0
Coordination mechanisms	4
References	3
Missing	34
Not applicable	21
Alternative plans	3
Within technical discipline	14
Non-classified	28
None of it	7

A general theme was that the plans are easy to complete when the right people are assigned to complete the PSP. This was apparent especially when one's background and training was compatible to the portion of the PSP they complete. The PSP was easy to complete when the scope was defined.

**29. Of those parts of the PSP/IPMP that you prepare, which parts do you find to be the hardest?**

	<u>Frequency</u>
Scope of studies	31
Responsibility	2
Schedule	30
Measures of progress and quality	3
Baseline feasibility study cost estimate	44
Procedure and criteria	0
Coordination mechanisms	13
References	1
Missing	36
Not applicable	27
Alternative plans	9
Contingencies	2
Non-classified	23
None of it	4

The respondents had a general problem developing estimates for future work required (e.g., for 12 to 24 months into the future). Coordination between parties to understand and/or complete tasks was considered vital to completing other PSP tasks.

**52. In the development and conduct of the feasibility study, which parts of the PSP/IPMP do you feel are most useful and why?**

	<u>Frequency</u>
Scope of studies	52
Responsibility	9
Schedule	69
Measures of progress and quality	0
Baseline feasibility study cost estimate	50
Procedure and criteria	0
Coordination mechanisms	12
References	0
Missing/don't know	30
None of it	5
Required detail	2
All of it	3
Alternative plans	1
Not applicable	7
Non-classified	8

General open-ended response themes

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
29	Framework for study/project to focus and track who does what
9	A method to track progress to maintain schedule (accountability)
5	Scheduling, if it follows facilities budgeting funding requirements
4	Reference point to justify changes when deviations from plan occur
2	A plan for future studies
2	Tends to reduce but not eliminate change
1	Method to explain study requirements to the sponsor
1	Teaching tool for young staff
1	Task listing provides sponsor a basis if in kind services desired
1	Scheduling and scope ensure good product results
1	Tasks are a starting point for unfamiliar projects
1	Once scopes are defined they change little

**53. In the development and conduct of the feasibility study, which parts of the PSP/IPMP do you feel are the least useful or the most constraining, and why?**

	<u>Frequency</u>
Scope of studies	4
Responsibility	2
Schedule	18
Measures of progress and quality	0
Baseline feasibility study cost estimate	9
Procedure and criteria	0
Coordination mechanisms	1
References	2
Missing/don't know	60
None of it	8
Required detail	23
All of it	3
Alternative plans	2
Not applicable	11
Non-classified	13

General open-ended response themes

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
21	The PSP is too detail specific for each task (i.e., subaccount dollar tracking), inflexible, and unmanageable. A general description should be sufficient
15	Studies often don't evolve as planned (i.e., Murphy's Law)
8	Work breakdown structure (WBS) and responsibility assignment matrix (RAM) provide no value to study management
5	Too many dollars spent on PSP leaving less resources for design/investigation
5	Project scope changes as PSP is being developed
3	Short time frame to complete the PSP
3	Schedules often developed without regard to district workload
3	Too many boiler plate plans
2	PSP often viewed as perfect even though based on preliminary information, needs flexibility
2	Never looked at once completed
2	Costly (i.e., dollars and time) to change PSP when project changes
2	Too much guess work in PSP
2	The written portion detailing what disciplines do is used for budgeting and scheduling but used infrequently afterwards
2	Schedule may lose meaning due to constraints
1	Not a consistent level of detail across all functions levels
1	The review process
1	Greater flexibility is needed in dealing with sponsors
1	Only management pays attention to schedules
1	PSP should be a guide and not detailed list of daily activities
1	The PSP is a costly process to get local sponsors dollars
1	Strict adherence to schedule may cause a poor or incomplete product to result
1	Cost associated with alternative plans
1	Let technical people generate plan and remove project manager from course of study
1	The flow charts are least useful
1	Regulation are not clear during the feasibility phase and these influence the cost

**66. Who should approve PSPs/IPMPs and why?**

	<u>Frequency</u>
District	51
Division	26
District and Sponsor	15
Headquarters	9
District and Division	7
Division and Sponsor	4
District and one higher level	3
Just one level	2
All levels	2
Sponsor	1
Division and Headquarters	1
ASA (CW)	1
Headquarters and sponsor	1
Corps and sponsor	1
Missing/don't know	32
Not applicable	4
Non-classified	15

General open-ended response themes: District

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
20	Those directly involved (team members) know the product best and are responsible
5	Reduces costs associated with PSP development
5	The PSP is a management control document and working document
2	When the project is below a dollar value threshold
2	Power down/in house buy in
2	By the Planning Review Board (PRB) were the study originated
1	Don't need division approval -- consistent with current QA/QC procedures
1	Command level at district (must be to reflect district priorities)
1	With headquarters or division oversight only
1	Because the work is done at this level
1	Because divisions no longer have technical review

General open-ended response themes: Division

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
5	PSP is tailored for local needs between district and division and Headquarters comments waste time
4	Responsible for quality control
3	Removed from study and can provide consistency among districts (checks and balances)
2	More familiar than headquarters with studies performed
1	The next highest level of review
1	More familiar with regional requirements
1	Can help defend future cost and schedule changes
1	See many projects and have knowledge base to inform districts about pitfalls

General open-ended response themes: District and Sponsor

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
4	With division or headquarter oversight
2	They are the only ones that matter
1	Higher ups may not understand or misinterpret study purpose/method
1	Headquarters should only approve dollars
1	Sponsor pays half the cost

General open-ended response themes: Headquarters

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
2	So they can't impose new regulations on study and sponsor has no surprise
2	As outlined in E.C. 1105-2-208
2	Ensures common goals/objectives throughout product development/review process
1	They control the dollars
1	For buy in
1	A consistent entity at headquarters

General open-ended response themes: Local

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
1	Promotes buy in and ownership

General open-ended response themes: ASA (CW)

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
1	Not getting buy in at this level at present time

General open-ended response themes: All

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
1	Groups responsible for funding decisions
1	To avoid major disagreements

General open-ended response themes: Non-classified

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
1	Someone other than the plan preparers to reduce bias
1	Technical speciality chiefs and study managers
1	Only at one level (i.e., either District, Division, HQ) to reduce time spent approving PSPs
1	Division and headquarter approval should only mean buy in
1	Doesn't matter who approves since no one enforces the agreement
1	Headquarters for policy issues

**67. Under what conditions should changes in the scope of the PSP/IPMP require approval by Division and/or Headquarters?**

	<u>Frequency</u>
Increased funding required (i.e., significant, 10-25% or more)	53
Policy related	29
Increased time/schedule to complete (i.e., significant, 6 months or >)	28
None should require division/headquarter approval	23
Increased size/scope	9
Controversial/political projects	8
When guideline requirements not met	4
Major significant changes	4
Redefinition of project (i.e., change from recreation to flood control)	2
If another functional goal develops	2
Conditions controlled by division/headquarters	1
As dictated by common sense	1
When study manager thinks it is important	1
Change in sponsor	1
Extraordinarily large projects (i.e., 25 million dollar project)	1
Changes in assumptions	1
When challenging internal COE requirements	1
Major deviations from original alternative	1
Missing/don't know	39
Not applicable	5
Non-classified	10

**68. The requirements for PSPs should be eliminated. If yes, why?**

	<u>Frequency</u>
The sponsor can't afford them, cost too much	10
The PSP is static and the study is dynamic	2
Not cost effective	2
We know how to do our job and should be held accountable for achieving results	2
Too much red tape	2
Used little after approved. Only schedule and cost estimate is needed	2
An agreement between the sponsor and district is only needed	1
Outdated and inaccurate by the time they're ready for approval	1
Not really used	1
Each feasibility study is unique and PMPs force studies into the same mold	1
Eliminate for small dollar projects	1
Change to a suggested "best management practice" rather than a requirement	1
PSP may improve team member communication, but schedule serves the same purpose	1
Waste of energy for typical/similar projects	1
Plan hinders flexibility	1
No added value from the documents	1
Bogs down the decision-making process	1

**69. What recommendations would you make to modify the current guidelines for PSPs/IPMPs?**

	<u>Frequency</u>
Less detail/keep it simple (i.e., cost and schedule)	31
Greater flexibility	18
More and clearer guidance (i.e., example of current excellence PSP, Cookbook of tasking)	17
Standardize the plans by study type	10
Keep at District level	6
Eliminate them	5
Increase time and detail in development of PSP	4
Require only when additional study funds required	1
Define work in phases to keep cost down of initial PSP	1
Increase accountability between study managers and technical speciality sections	1
Require PSPs for studies exceeding a limit (i.e., 7.5 million)	1
Don't create in isolation	1
Approve at MSC level	1
Enforce PSP agreements	1
Include local political impacts that may kill study	1
Eliminate project managers ability to allocate dollars to level four	1
Emphasize team approach with PSP development	1
Develop PSP after recon. report approved	1
Missing/don't know	66
Not applicable	7
Non-classified	13

**70. Are there any additional comments you would like to make about PSPs/IPMPs and/or the Corps planning process?**

	<u>Frequency</u>
Need to be streamlined/simplified	10
Does nothing for the quality of product	5
More flexibility	4
Rush to complete PSP due to procrastination and/or inadequate time to complete PSP	4
PSPs a step in the right direction	3
One level of review of any products	3
Proper planning takes time and money, well worth it	3
Tailor it got it is a guide for conducting study	2
Establish review position for developing PSP	2
Little attention given to identification/coordination of technical work	2
Too much reporting and documenting, costly	2
Tool for conducting study	2
Planning process is too slow	2
Should be just one planning report	1
Agree with most of the PSP	1
When project managers produce PSPs, delivered quality products result	1
Benefits those who would otherwise be negligent	1
Get sponsors input/comments	1
PSPs divert limited manpower from performing tasks to produce the feasibility report	1
PSPs become turf battles for responsibility and money	1
District becoming more comfortable at defining tasks and communicating with each other	1
Need special funding for PSP preparation	1
Need training and reason why PSP needed	1
Initial study cost 100% cost, 50/50 cost share for alternative comparisons	1
Missing	109
Not applicable	6

**Comments about individual survey questions and the response directed towards the question.**

12. Varies with individual reviewers.
12. PSPs once developed are not used again.
13. Sufficient time and resources are available for an acceptable level but not usually for the level desired by DIU/HQ.
13. District review time of completed document is usually too brief due to time constraints.
13. More detail is being required increasing PSP time requirements.
13. Limited funds to develop PSP.
13. Level of sponsor participation dramatically affects time/cost.
14. Need good examples.
14. Less volume is needed.
14. HQUSACE should distribute their perceived excellent PSPs.
16. Abbreviated PSPs should probably only reference normal processes.
16. Quality control expectations need better definitions.
20. Lack of coordination among offices.
27. Technical experts definitely need training in requirement and preparation of PSPs.
27. The amount of detail that is in question.
29. Impossible to know what drilling and testing is required until further into study.
30. Schedule often not followed due to local and district priorities.
30. PSP should be flexible for needed change.
33. Can't foresee all possible outcomes during course of study.
35. Technical offices prepare PSP input and never look at it again, and study manager must then send work request for task and money listed in PSP to ensure adherence
35. Work requests still needed since annual funding and projects cover 2-3 years.
35. Some still need written directions.
36. Many times division pays no attention to PSPs and continue the old expensive way.
36. The PSP should be treated as a contract between Corps and Sponsor. New items should have input from sponsor.
37. On an individual technical basis, but interaction among disciplines is a core.

- 42. Deviations should occur to produce quality produce if sponsor agrees.
- 42. Tendency to avoid change.
- 45. For complicated issues PSPs can be critical if developed in timely manner.
- 45. To many technical complications typically arise during the feasibility study.
- 46. PSPs developed during later stages of recons and many unknowns still exist.
- 48. PSP understood by those who develop it, but other rarely take time to read and become familiar with it.
- 49. When tasks lack a specific description.
- 54. PSPs haven't changed the quality of our studies.
- 55. If we don't use more -- make less detail.
- 55. Schedule not followed in PSP and schedule not revived to account for change.
- 55. Not a waste of time/money if used properly.
- 55. PSPs are currently too complex and this limits their use to the fullest extent.
- 56. Graded on amount of money spent so cost savings decrease rating.
- 56. Could be done at a proper level.
- 56. PSP is cost effective if negotiation and review isn't prolonged.
- 56. Can save money if used properly.
- 57. Some type of study plan is needed, doesn't matter what type.
- 60. Not without a major overhaul
- 62. PSPs have milestones regardless whether a quality or complete document has been finished.
- 64. While many PSP items are identified in recon. Study, time is a big constraint prior to recon. submittal. RRC issues may change PSP contents.
- 70. For smaller projects, say under \$5 million, district should decide what projects are for.
- 70. Funds needed up front to develop PSPs
- 10, 14. Successful could be PSPs provided for guidance
- 10, 11, 12, 17. Size of document has increased from 10 to 100 pages due to new guidance and detail
- 18, 24. Prepare PSP after RBC when feasibility issues better defined.
- 40, 41. Provide sponsor with greater detail/understanding or conduct of study.
- 50, 51. PSP doesn't guarantee product quality, quality results from team authority and ownership.

50, 51. PSP is a tool and doesn't change district responsibility.

50, 51, 62. PSPs don't increase schedule accountability since district prioritization/workload destroys even the most conservative schedule. Schedule useful for gauging progress and for inquiry purposes. Leadership places schedule and budget at a higher priority than product quality.

\_\_\_ This survey won't change mind set of HQ.

\_\_\_ Listed in PSP to insure adherence.

\_\_\_ Need all three equally treated.

\_\_\_ The PSP should be viewed as a living document that has the flexibility to change. It is developed on the best available estimates and can't predict everything.



**APPENDIX D**

**MATRIX OF SIGNIFICANT  
CORRELATIONS AMONG SURVEY QUESTIONS**







## **APPENDIX E**

### **MAIL SURVEY RELATIONS BETWEEN NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES AND SURVEY CHARACTERISTICS**

- Table E-1: Relations Between Negative and Positive Attitudes and Response to Other Attitudinal Questions
- Table E-2: Relations Between Negative and Positive Attitudes and Response to Questions Concerning PSP Development
- Table E-3: Relations Between Negative and Positive Attitudes and response to Questions Concerning PSP Use
- Table E-4: Relations Between Negative and Positive Attitudes and response to Questions Concerning PSP Recommendations



**TABLE E-1**  
**RELATIONS BETWEEN NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES**  
**AND RESPONSE TO OTHER ATTITUDINAL QUESTIONS**

**Percent response (frequency) to PSP attitude questions within the groups of agree/disagree response to the question whether PSPs are a waste of time (Q55a)**

<b>Survey Statement</b>	<b>PSPs are a Waste of Time</b>			
	<b>Agree</b>		<b>Disagree</b>	
The quality of planning studies has improved with the advent of PSPs/IPMPs.				
Disagree	88%	(36)	39%	(29)
Agree	12%	(5)	61%	(46)
PSPs/IPMPs are a waste of time and/or money in general.				
Disagree	18%	(7)	100%	(92)
Agree	82%	(32)	0%	(0)
In the long run, the requirement for a PSP/IPMP saves money.				
Disagree	84%	(31)	32%	(24)
Agree	16%	(6)	68%	(52)
There is adequate knowledge of what is required and how to accomplish feasibility studies, without relying on PSPs/IPMPs				
a. In my district				
Disagree	14%	(6)	61%	(57)
Agree	86%	(38)	39%	(36)
b. In general				
Disagree	14%	(5)	68%	(54)
Agree	86%	(31)	32%	(26)
The PSP/IPMP guidance requires too much detail.				
Disagree	15%	(6)	44%	(38)
Agree	85%	(34)	56%	(48)
PSPs/IPMPs increase accountability for schedule and budget at the direct expense of product quality.				
Disagree	55%	(23)	61%	(55)
Agree	45%	(19)	39%	(35)
The benefits of PSPs/IPMPs will become apparent with more experience.				
Disagree	79%	(27)	8%	(7)
Agree	21%	(7)	92%	(75)
PSPs/IPMPs help to keep feasibility studies within the specified budget.				
Disagree	57%	(24)	19%	(17)
Agree	43%	(18)	81%	(73)

**TABLE E-1 (Continued)**  
**RELATIONS BETWEEN NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES**  
**AND RESPONSE TO OTHER ATTITUDINAL QUESTIONS**

<b>Survey Statement</b>	<b><u>PSPs are a Waste of Time</u></b>	
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
PSPs/IPMPs help to keep feasibility studies within the specified timeline.		
Disagree	55% (23)	20% (18)
Agree	45% (19)	80% (74)
The Corps planning process has improved as a result of the requirement for PSPs/IPMPs.		
Disagree	92% (34)	21% (15)
Agree	8% (3)	79% (58)

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate frequency of response.

**TABLE E-2**  
**RELATIONS BETWEEN NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES**  
**AND RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING PSP DEVELOPMENT**

**Percent response (frequency) to PSP development questions within the groups of agree/disagree response to the question whether PSPs are a waste of time (Q55a)**

<u>Survey Statement</u>	<u>PSPs are a Waste of Time</u>	
	Agree	Disagree
Headquarter's staff provide <u>adequate</u> official guidance to develop PSPs/IPMPs.		
Disagree	56% (23)	36% (27)
Agree	44% (18)	64% (49)
Headquarter's staff provided <u>consistent</u> official guidance to develop PSPs/IPMPs.		
Disagree	75% (27)	46% (34)
Agree	25% (9)	54% (40)
Headquarter's staff provide consistent feedback upon review of PSPs/IPMPs.		
Disagree	76% (26)	63% (41)
Agree	24% (8)	37% (26)
Sufficient time and resources are provided for the preparation of PSPs/IPMPs.		
Disagree	62% (26)	43% (42)
Agree	38% (16)	57% (56)
Additional guidance is needed to help develop PSPs/IPMPs.		
Disagree	44% (18)	47% (41)
Agree	56% (23)	53% (47)
Previously approved PSPs/IPMPs are typically used as a template for developing new PSPs/IPMPs.		
Disagree	5% (2)	5% (5)
Agree	95% (42)	95% (91)
PSPs/IPMPs are an appropriate place to incorporate district Quality Control Plans.		
Disagree	30% (12)	12% (10)
Agree	70% (28)	88% (77)
Review standards change as new PSPs/IPMPs are submitted.		
Disagree	12% (4)	19% (14)
Agree	88% (30)	81% (61)
Issues raised at the Recon Review Conference can change the work scopes of the PSP/IPMP.		
Disagree	5% (2)	1% (1)
Agree	95% (39)	99% (95)

**TABLE E-2 (Continued)**  
**RELATIONS BETWEEN NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES**  
**AND RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING PSP DEVELOPMENT**

<b>Survey Statement</b>	<b><u>PSPs are a Waste of Time</u></b>			
	<b>Agree</b>		<b>Disagree</b>	
The part of the PSP/IPMP that pertains to my discipline is developed by the study manager/project manager.				
Disagree	46%	(19)	50%	(44)
Agree	54%	(22)	50%	(44)
During the development of the PSP/IPMP, the technical experts for each discipline coordinate their efforts to ensure data required for each discipline are developed in a proper and timely manner.				
Disagree	24%	(11)	21%	(21)
Agree	76%	(34)	79%	(78)
I am always given an opportunity to provide meaningful input into the development of the PSP/IPMP pertaining to work I will be expected to do				
Disagree	29%	(11)	17%	(16)
Agree	71%	(27)	83%	(78)
My review comments and concerns are normally incorporated during the development of the PSP/IPMP.				
Disagree	0%	(0)	9%	(9)
Agree	100%	(41)	91%	(87)
I know how to develop that part of the PSP that pertains to my area of expertise.				
Disagree	14%	(6)	4%	(4)
Agree	86%	(37)	96%	(88)
I develop the task description and budget needs for that part of the PSP that pertains to my area of expertise.				
Disagree	21%	(8)	6%	(5)
Agree	79%	(30)	94%	(84)

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate frequency of response.

**TABLE E-3**  
**RELATIONS BETWEEN NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES**  
**AND RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING PSP USE**

**Percent response (frequency) to PSP use questions within the groups of agree/disagree response to the question whether PSPs are a waste of time (Q55a)**

<b>Survey Statement</b>	<b>PSPs are a Waste of Time</b>			
	<b>Agree</b>		<b>Disagree</b>	
PSPs/IPMPs are followed closely during feasibility studies.				
Disagree	80%	(33)	33%	(30)
Agree	20%	(8)	67%	(60)
The PSP/IPMP is used to keep track of the feasibility study schedule/time line.				
Disagree	42%	(17)	20%	(17)
Agree	58%	(23)	80%	(69)
The PSP/IPMP is used to keep track of the cost of the feasibility study.				
Disagree	55%	(21)	26%	(22)
Agree	45%	(17)	74%	(63)
Adherence to the PSP/IPMP during the development of the feasibility study reduces the number of revisions to the study during review.				
Disagree	86%	(30)	40%	(33)
Agree	14%	(5)	60%	(50)
The PSP/IPMP is used as a reference point for product/report review.				
Disagree	51%	(19)	26%	(22)
Agree	49%	(18)	74%	(61)
PSPs/IPMPs have eliminated the need for work requests.				
Disagree	97%	(37)	85%	(63)
Agree	3%	(1)	15%	(11)
Because PSPs/IPMPs make explicit assumptions regarding the conduct of the feasibility study, they make it easier to get changes in the feasibility study approved.				
Disagree	97%	(29)	47%	(33)
Agree	3%	(1)	53%	(37)
PSPs/IPMPs are reviewed after the feasibility study in order to identify problems that could occur in future studies (i.e., in order to learn lessons).				
Disagree	94%	(33)	64%	(44)
Agree	6%	(2)	36%	(25)
PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>coordination</u> among people assigned to work on feasibility studies.				
Disagree	70%	(31)	20%	(18)
Agree	30%	(13)	80%	(72)

**TABLE E-3 (Continued)**  
**RELATIONS BETWEEN NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES**  
**AND RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING PSP USE**

<b>Survey Statement</b>	<b>PSPs are a Waste of Time</b>			
	<b>Agree</b>		<b>Disagree</b>	
PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>communication</u> among people assigned to work on feasibility studies.				
Disagree	64%	(28)	21%	(18)
Agree	36%	(16)	79%	(68)
PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>coordination</u> among sponsors, consultants, and other external organizations that have a role in the feasibility study.				
Disagree	53%	(19)	10%	(8)
Agree	47%	(17)	90%	(71)
PSPs/IPMPs have improved <u>communication</u> among sponsors, consultants, and other external organizations that have a role in the feasibility study.				
Disagree	64%	(23)	13%	(10)
Agree	36%	(13)	87%	(65)
Deviations from the PSP/IPMP are avoided, even when they really should not be.				
Disagree	72%	(26)	78%	(63)
Agree	28%	(10)	22%	(18)
The existence of a PSP helps me and/or my district do a better job during the project feasibility stage.				
Disagree	63%	(26)	12%	(10)
Agree	37%	(15)	88%	(75)
My district's leadership (i.e., Section Chiefs and Planning Chief) have a positive and supportive view of PSPs/IPMPs.				
Disagree	49%	(17)	15%	(13)
Agree	51%	(18)	85%	(72)
The cost of PSPs/IPMPs are offset by savings during the feasibility study process.				
Disagree	97%	(34)	47%	(24)
Agree	3%	(1)	53%	(27)
PSPs/IPMPs help identify potential problems that may be encountered in a feasibility study.				
Disagree	36%	(16)	13%	(12)
Agree	64%	(29)	87%	(83)
The PSP/IPMP process removes the flexibility that is necessary during the feasibility study.				
Disagree	36%	(16)	79%	(68)
Agree	64%	(28)	21%	(18)

**TABLE E-3 (Continued)**  
**RELATIONS BETWEEN NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES**  
**AND RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING PSP USE**

<b>Survey Statement</b>	<b><u>PSPs are a Waste of Time</u></b>	
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
PSPs/IPMPs improve coordination among functional elements during the feasibility process		
Disagree	70% (31)	25% (22)
Agree	30% (13)	75% (66)
Project sponsors are often confused by PSPs/IPMPs.		
Disagree	18% (6)	45% (29)
Agree	82% (27)	55% (35)
PSPs/IPMPs make <u>districts</u> more accountable for:		
a. Product quality		
Disagree	82% (32)	42% (35)
Agree	18% (7)	58% (48)
b. Study schedule		
Disagree	38% (16)	8% (7)
Agree	62% (26)	92% (85)
c. Study budget		
Disagree	40% (17)	6% (5)
Agree	60% (25)	94% (86)
PSPs/IPMPs make <u>team members</u> more accountable for:		
a. Product quality		
Disagree	83% (34)	43% (37)
Agree	17% (7)	57% (49)
b. Study schedule		
Disagree	41% (18)	15% (14)
Agree	59% (26)	85% (78)
c. Study budget		
Disagree	52% (23)	15% (14)
Agree	48% (21)	85% (78)

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate frequency of response.

**TABLE E-4**  
**RELATIONS BETWEEN NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES**  
**AND RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING PSP RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Percent response (frequency) to PSP recommendation questions within the groups of agree/disagree response to the question whether PSPs are a waste of time (Q55a)**

<b>Survey Statement</b>	<b><u>PSPs are a Waste of Time</u></b>			
	<b>Agree</b>		<b>Disagree</b>	
Preparation of PSPs/IPMPs should occur after approval of the draft reconnaissance report.				
Disagree	19%	(7)	20%	(19)
Agree	81%	(30)	80%	(76)
PSPs/IPMPs should be produced in a standard format.				
Disagree	33%	(13)	29%	(28)
Agree	67%	(27)	71%	(69)
The requirement for PSPs/IPMPs should be eliminated.				
Yes	60%	(22)	5%	(5)
No	40%	(15)	95%	(87)

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate frequency of response.

## **APPENDIX F**

### **TELEPHONE SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**



Q1. Almost 68 percent of the respondents to the mail survey do not believe that HQ provides consistent feedback upon review of PSPs. What do you believe is the cause of the inconsistent feedback? Can you provide an example related to your own experience with the PSP review process?

**Almost 68 percent of the respondents to the mail survey do not believe that HQ provides consistent feedback upon review of PSPs. What do you believe is the cause of the inconsistent feedback?**

1) We have had only a few PSPs go through the review process and comments from HQ have tended to be consistent and minimal. HQ has generally agreed with the draft PSP we sent for review.

2) There is a lack of organization at headquarters. They are still set up in a stovepipe and do not exhibit a teamwork approach.

3) There are many people who review PSPs. It is often left to the reviewer to decide what they think should be in the PSP, rather than having a standard that PSPs should follow. From the IPMPs/PSPs that we have developed, the level of detail required has increased as new PSPs are submitted. Thus, what was supposed to be included in a previous PSP is not sufficient now. We need more exact guidance in regard to the detail that HQ wants included in a PSP.

4) This could be the result of administration policies changing. Also, there are numerous reviewers and the opinions and desires of these people may differ.

5) Upon initial review of a PSP, HQ may have some items they want further addressed. After these are addressed and sent back to HQ, they may find more to address. This cycle of review and HQ wanting additional items addressed seems to mainly create job security on their part. In some instances, reviewers never prepared an actual PSP, but they are providing guidance and requesting unnecessary information that does not add value to the document. Many comments and concerns are raised because they do not have prior knowledge of a project site being reviewed. Over 90% of the comments and concerns raised by HQ during their review of the draft PSP could easily be resolved expeditiously by having the reviewer pick up the phone and call the project manager and/or team member. Instead, comments are provided in writing, through various channels and sit for weeks unaddressed. No person to person conversations to discuss these concerns occur. HQ needs to be aware that they are a team member also and should dialogue with the team that prepared the PSP, to resolve issues face to face. The objective is to expeditiously execute a FCSA/PSP and initiate and complete a feasibility study. This is not accomplished efficiently by mail back and forth, and comments from unknown reviewers who do not wish to discuss face to face issues.

6) Headquarter's may have other priorities that they must attend to.

7) This could directly result from having different personnel at HQ review PSPs. Expectations of what should be included in a PSP would differ among the reviewers.

8) There is no standard review process. Different people review PSPs resulting in inconsistent feedback.

9) One problem is the people that write the guidance have either been away from managing projects for some time or have never managed projects. It appears the information they want in a PSP is for their benefit so they can understand what the project is totally about. The PSP then becomes a checklist for them to monitor a study, even though studies do not usually go as anticipated.

10) This partially relates to the PSP being a new process and growing document. Also, HQ has been trying to streamline the PSP.

11) We receive feedback from HQ sometimes in the form of a question with a question where we are referred to guidance that we may not be familiar with. Also our PSPs tend to be vague and we are not quite sure what their question refers to.

12) We are provided with general guidance to develop PSPs. However, when we receive feedback from HQ on the specific detail they want included in a PSP, it is greater than detail requirements given in the general guidance.

13) This mainly depends on the reviewer and their personnel bias.

14) Every project is a little different where political policies affect each study and cause different requirements.

15) Not sure

16) Consistency is lacking in the requirements and what is expected in the guidance. We believe the PSP was initiated as a tool or living document, rather than a plan containing minute detail. The PSP is a document that should be updated as things arise.

17) Largely due to the fact that the reviewers at HQ have been removed from district level at least for a few years. Thus, they have not been able to apply the guidance in which they are trying to provide. Also, there are multiple offices that review and provide guidance on PSPs. The interpretation of the guidance they provide varies. This may be the result of staffing changes.

18) Headquarters policies lack consistency. Also, an understanding of regulations tends to vary among districts.

19) There are different people who review the PSPs at HQ and their views may differ. Also, view points may change with time along with a revamping of policy.

20) Not sure, however I can speculate that the problem arises from many different reviewers. The reviewers may be highly focused on a particular problem such as policy issues.

**Can you provide an example related to your own experience with the PSP review process?**

- 1) Not sure
- 2) Just yesterday we asked for clarification at HQ if we should do a 205 or 206. Headquarters could not respond on the correct way to go and could only decide if a written plan was submitted.
- 3) We have had this problem with all PSPs submitted. The sponsor is not having the problem with PSPs. The iterative process of PSP submission, feedback and rework of the PSP, and resubmission encumbers the process.
- 4) The effort required to develop a PSP should be left to the professional judgement of the PSP developer(s) in concert with the sponsor.
- 5) The level of detail has greatly expanded in the PSPs. For example, a IPMP/PSP developed 3 years ago was 8 pages and now they are 100 plus pages. Further, the WBS in the last PSP was 19 pages, while it was only 4 pages in a previous one. Thus, the level of detail may be to great.
- 6) None come to mind.
- 7) We recently sent 2 PSPs that were similar to HQ for review. The comments provided for the PSPs were inconsistent. In some areas in a PSP, HQ wanted additional information. The other PSP had adequate information in these areas.
- 8) When we send a PSP or report up for review comments and make revisions. We have no assurance that the same people will conduct the final review. In addition, new and revised guidance may appear to the sponsors that we are constantly shooting at a moving target.
- 9) From 2 recent PSPs we developed, the level of detail they wanted was extraordinarily large. It is not possible to provide a meaningful level of detail that HQ wants for a study that lasts multiple years. Hence, we are able to develop a roadmap to follow, but tracking the exact path from point a to b as originally developed in the PSP is not possible. For example, I may want to get from Chicago to Portland and may decide what roads to take, but until I start traveling I do not know what road will be open to travel on.
- 10) I recently put my first PSPs together and have not sent it up for review yet.
- 11) Not sure
- 12) None come to mind.
- 13) I am in the technical area and do not personally see the review comments.
- 14) We had a study in which HQ had interest and what they originally wanted changed after the PSP was developed. For one Harbor project, we were setup to do a limited economic analysis based on data from the sponsor. HQ feedback specified they wanted additional economic data.

However, this additional analysis required additional funds which were not available due to limited funding.

15) I cannot remember getting feedback at all from HQ on a PSP. All of the comments come from the division office. I do not know what role HQ has played in the approval process.

16) The exact requirements for what to include in the PSP is lacking.

17) When a PSP goes to the ASA (CW) for review and the ASA (CW) provides comments, the reviewers then try to have future PSPs incorporate the suggestions of the ASA (CW).

18) The interpretation of guidelines HQ provides is not consistent. Policy interpretation among districts and at a district may differ from the intent of HQ.

19) I have had no significant problems to date.

20) No I have not.

Q2. Nearly all respondents to the mail survey believed that they had the expertise to develop PSPs. However, nearly half of the sample thought additional guidance was needed. Do you believe additional guidance is needed to develop PSPs? Why?

**Nearly all respondents to the mail survey believed that they had the expertise to develop PSPs. However, nearly half of the sample thought additional guidance was needed. Do you believe additional guidance is needed to develop PSPs?**

1) Yes and no

2) Yes

3) Not sure

4) Yes

5) Yes

6) Yes and no

7) Not sure additional guidance is needed.

8) Yes

9) Some might be needed.

10) Yes when I completed the mail survey, but now leaning to no.

11) Yes

12) Yes

13) Yes

14) Yes

15) Yes

16) No if the PSP is a living document, yes if the PSP is a document we will be graded on.

17) Yes/no

18) Yes

## Why?

- 1) We tend to know what is required to perform a study. The problem is we need approval for a PSP that was developed in a sense for a moving target. This means that HQ keeps changing the requirement of what is required in PSP. The PSP is supposed to include a level of data that is greater than is needed to complete the study.
- 2) We need to develop an understanding of the level of detail, such as in the WBS, that is required to develop a PSP. Reviews at HQ need to only suggest what level is required to execute.
- 3) The guidance is constantly changing. The project can also dictate how the PSP should be developed.
- 4) Not sure
- 5) A standard outline of what is required is needed to provide consistency, but not more reporting. Also, a standard for the level of detail required is needed. The detail of a PSP should be proportional to the cost of the study. Smaller studies would require less detail.
- 6) The problem we tend to have with PSPs concerns the level of detail to include and the interaction of different technical areas (i.e., H&H, planning, and environmental). We need clarification of the level of detail that should be included. The logic in the guidance is for the big steps of how to complete a PSP, but not with the small steps, or detail. We use MS project to help with the management of projects. The software works well for larger detail, but not well when small detail is tracked.
- 7) Less guidance may be needed and a few points clarified for consistency in the framework of PSPs among districts. We need to know what HQ is looking for in a PSP so we can reduce the guesswork involved with what they anticipate.
- 8) Clarification of what is wanted in the PSP is needed. We can interpret the guidance, but our interpretation may not mesh with the intent of HQ. HQ should be more flexible on the PSPs. It would appear they want to standardize the PSPs, make the PSPs all the same. If the PSP sent forward will provide the product desired, then HQ should approve the PSP without any comments.
- 9) We have lost many seasoned employees in recent times. The new employees have little experience in developing PSPs and may benefit from additional guidance.
- 10) Part of the problem is lately we think we know how to develop a PSP, but new guidance comes along that requires more detail than we have been providing.
- 11) Examples of previous PSPs others have developed would be useful. We all seem to have our own tricks and methods for developing PSPs.

12) We need additional guidance from HQ to be consistent with the PSP feedback we are receiving from HQ.

13) Additional guidance is needed when it comes to the level of detail required in a PSP.

14) Limited guidance is currently provided.

15) In some areas of the guidance we were not quite sure of what was required in the PSP. For example, it was not clear to what level of detail was required to prepare the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) included in the back of the official guidance. Further, the outline in the back of the official guidance deviated from what was expected in an IPMP when compared to information included in previously prepared IPMPs. Therefore, the format and level of detail used in preparing the first PSP was similar to that used in preparing the last IPMP I prepared.

16) Flexibility is needed with the PSP for individual study needs. It is a living document and tool for managing a study.

17) Clarification is needed on the guidance. The current guidance is simple and leaves room for interpretation.

18) The PSPs that have come over my desk having varied in their quality, and the format among the PSPs has not been consistent. The PSP in itself is a plan for conducting the study. Guidance to produce a consistent format would be helpful.

Q3. It was evident in our analysis of the mail survey that issues raised at the Recon Review Conference can impact/change the PSP. Indeed, over 80 percent of the survey respondents recommended that preparation of the PSP take place after the Recon Review Conference. How would this improve the planning process? How would you see an independent phase for developing PSPs fitting into the current 2 step planning process (i.e., Recon and Feasibility)?

**It was evident in our analysis of the mail survey that issues raised at the Recon Review Conference can impact/change the PSP. Indeed, over 80 percent of the survey respondents recommended that preparation of the PSP take place after the Recon Review Conference. How would this improve the planning process?**

1) We would get a better sense of the scope and questions that arise at the RRC from sponsor and HQ/division input.

2) Discussions at Recon can change the scope of the PSP. Thus, these changes must be incorporated into the PSP before its approval.

3) This would increase the time needed to complete the steps required before we can get into feasibility. However, since issues that arise at the RRC can change the PSP, or the scope/tasks of the study, we can resolve issues at the RRC prior to completion of the PSP. Currently, we must go back to the sponsor and negotiate the changes in the PSP.

4) This would allow for meaningful input from all players at the RRC. The discussions of the level of effort required that result could be incorporated into the PSP.

5) This would be helpful as it would allow HQ and the district to agree on the scope and the plan prior to putting it together. Also, unresolved policy issues from the sponsor or district could be addressed at the RRC prior to development of the PSP. It seems we have to constantly educate the division and HQ about the study since HQ has about a 10% knowledge base of the study and the division has a 50 % knowledge base.

6) Having HQ provide up-front comments would provide us with a better direction of where to go.

7) This would eliminate rework of the PSP. It would also reduce apprehension on part of the sponsor when they accept the PSP (i.e., buy in) only to later have the PSP changed. This would improve the credibility of the district.

8) This would give the technical areas a better understanding of what is expected and what needs to be done.

9) Not quite sure. However, there are advantages preparing the PSP before and after the RRC. A draft PSP that is developed to discuss during the RRC is desirable.

10) This is a good idea. When the RRC is held there are issues that arise that change the content of the PSP. These issues need to be incorporated into the PSP and can change our cost estimates.

11) Preparing the PSP after the RRC would avoid work associated with changing the PSP when changes are needed to be made to the PSP due to findings from the RRC.

12) Originally we finished the Recon phase within 12 months and the PSP and FCSA were submitted during the review process. Now we are required to submit the Recon report, PSP, and FCSA before a RRC can be scheduled. This is added pressure and we must now complete all of this within the same 12 month time period. This just creates added and unnecessary work because we must now take the comments from the RRC and rework the PSP. It would be wiser to develop the PSP closer to the approval of the FCSA with the local sponsor so both the FCSA and PSP are in close agreement with what the sponsor wants. Remember, the FCSA is the contract we agree to with the sponsor.

13) Typically, issues at the RRC are policy interpretation issues. Interpretation of the policy issues and resolution should be part of the review of the PSP. When policy is an issue, an Issue Resolution Conference (IRC) should be scheduled prior to the RRC. I think a draft PSP should be completed ASAP. There will always be changes to draft documents. Ideas should be put in writing to initiate closure and approval.

14) We may find 2 through 3 alternatives from the Recon phase. However, as we get into feasibility the local sponsor may not agree with the alternatives. The completion of the PSP after the Recon phase would allow this issue to be resolved up-front and avoid later problems with the local sponsor.

15) When we develop a PSP to be included with the RRC, we have to make guesses and assumptions in what comments will arise at the RRC from what the district, local sponsor, and HQ want and needs to be looked at.

16) The completion of the PSP after the RRC would eliminate the rework of the PSP that currently occurs. Policy issues especially arise at the RRC.

17) At the RRC issues usually arise that can change the PSP. The PSP is already negotiated with the local sponsor prior to the submitting it at the RRC. We can incorporate issues into the PSP prior to its final develop and negotiation with a sponsor. Thus, resolution of questions on the part of higher ups prior to approval of the PSP would save time and money with negotiations with the local sponsor.

18) Issues that arise at the RRC can change the PSP. Thus, these issues could then be incorporated into the PSP more easily.

19) The RRC can impact the scope or direction of the study. This scenario would eliminate a duplication of work when the comments and issues raised at the RRC can be incorporated into the PSP, rather than trying to anticipate the issues that may arise at the RRC. The current method

is a paper game where we send the PSP for review; receive comments for changes, make changes and resubmit; get additional items to address, make changes, and resubmit.

20) We would have a better understanding of where we are going with future planning studies and the adjustments that would be needed, including in-depth coordination with the local sponsor, following completion of the reconnaissance report.

21) It would be beneficial to have the PSP completed after the RRC. This would allow comments and changes from the RRC to be incorporated into the PSP.

22) It would help but would stretch the study process out. Also tech review is now occurring at the district. At a minimum the technical aspects of the PSP should be developed prior to the RRC. Policy issues may need discussion at the RRC and can be addressed in the PSP after the RRC. The bottom line is a significant portion of the PSP should be developed prior to the RRC since we have to have an understanding for schedule and cost at that time.

23) The development of the Recon report is the result of a great amount of work. The PSP is the last part of this work effort and the quality of the PSP is poorer as the result of this.

24) First, it is a good idea to think about the PSP during the Recon phase. Developing a full blown PSP for the RRC wastes time when changes have to be made to the PSP due to issues raised at the RRC. Second, 12 months is a short time frame to accomplish the Recon phase along with the PSP. Further, the addition of the technical review at the district level will add to the work load at this time.

25) It would be an improvement to have PSP finalized after the RRC. At the RRC alternatives become better understood and can then be incorporated into the PSP.

26) The planning process would improve if the RRC is held in a timely fashion after the submittal of the Recon report.

27) It would help to present a picture to the sponsor that the Corps is consistent. Currently the PSP is developed with assumption of what could happen at the RRC. In reality, issues that arise at the RRC change the PSP. The changed PSP must then be explained to the sponsor and this makes us look inconsistent with how we will approach feasibility. Completing the PSP after the RRC would reduce the time needed to go back to the sponsor and explaining changes.

**How would you see an independent phase for developing PSPs fitting into the current 2 step planning process (i.e., Recon and Feasibility)?**

1) A separate phase is not a good idea. Rather, a draft PSP should be developed for review at the RRC that is loose enough so the scope as modified by issues and negotiation at the RRC can be reflected in the PSP. We do not need a completed PSP that has been reviewed/approved by the local sponsor at the RRC.

2) I do not believe an independent phase for developing PSPs is desirable. The reason being is it could increase the time that is currently needed to get through Recon and the PSP. A possible alternative is the majority of a PSP is developed during the Recon stage. After the Recon phase is completed and approved, and changes that result from Recon are incorporated into the PSP before its final approval.

3) Generally, I like this idea. However, having an separate PSP phase would increase the time required to complete Recon and the PSP. I think it would be more appropriate to have the RRC held earlier than it currently occurs. We would then be able to resolve issues that occur at the RRC. If we had a separate PSP phase I think this would end up being linked to the budget. I believe that higher authority approval of PSPs should only occur to test if the project is of national interest. The district should have approval for the content of the PSP as it addresses how to carry out the study.

4) This would work if we do not get stuck in an iteration of HQ review comments and PSP revision.

5) This would be helpful by resolving questions from HQ up-front and either educating HQ that their question is not an issue with the study or their question is valuable incite that we need to address.

6) At Recon we solve up-front what is feasible and what is not. Having PSP approval after the RRC would eliminate addressing areas that are not feasible.

7) We have used this method on 2 projects. In one project we had the PSP partially done prior to the RRC and the other project the PSP was developed after the RRC. Although this was more satisfactory, time delays still resulted. As currently required, starting the feasibility study 3-6 months after completion of the Recon phase is unrealistic.

8) From a technical standpoint this would help provide us with a background and knowledge base to develop the PSP just as long as the time frame for completing Recon and the PSP is not increased. Further, it would be beneficial to reduce the time needed to complete the PSP so the elements contained in the PSP do not become out of date.

9) A draft PSP is desirable for discussing PSP issues at the RRC. However, final approval of the PSP after the RRC may reduce a problem with accomplishing Recon within the 12 month requirement.

10) Another phase is not a good idea. Rather, a draft PSP should be developed prior to the RRC. Comments that result at the RRC can be incorporated in the PSP. It would be a good idea to have the finalization of the PSP after the RRC, given a draft PSP would be completed for the RRC.

11) It makes sense to have a phase of developing PSPs in between the RRC and Feasibility.

12) The Recon report provides us with the buy in with HQ. We can then learn from the RRC process and complete the PSP with the incorporation of the issues from the RRC. The FCSA

should judge what should be in the PSP. Using this logic, if the local sponsor is satisfied with what should be done in a study, the PSP should reflect this and contain more.

13) This would work. But if the issue is with the PSP itself, a draft PSP would need to be completed before the RRC. If a policy issue is the problem, then we could resolve it at an IRC.

14) This makes sense.

15) This would work out better if the PSP was developed/completed after the RRC. The issues that arise at the RRC could then be incorporated into the PSP. Thus removing much of the guesswork and assumptions.

16) This is not a good idea. It seems we are currently in this situation since the PSPs we are developing are big documents and costing too much to develop.

17) This is the way it should be. It used to also be this way prior to the recent requirement of submitting the PSP along with the Recon report for discussion at the RRC.

18) I have a concern that this would increase the time frame that currently occurs during the study and could create dead time. On the other hand, it would be beneficial in that alternatives that arise at the RRC could be incorporated into the PSP. Perhaps, a generic PSP or outline that addresses the scope could be developed for the RRC.

19) I would hate to see a separate phase as this would increase the time frame for completing Recon and the PSP. Rather, I think a framework or outline for the PSP be developed and discussed at the RRC. Formal approval of the PSP would then occur after the RRC. This would allow for issues to be addressed at the RRC and resolved.

20) I believe this may be a favorable way to go. This would take the pressure off the study managers and study team in general; perhaps a provision of separate funding for this phase would also be helpful since there is a tendency to expend too much of the available reconnaissance funds during preparation of the reconnaissance report. Also, in cases where the sponsor wants to contribute a high percentage of in-kind services, say up to a full 25 %, the separate phase would provide additional time, hopefully, so that a more thorough and better effort can be done in preparing meaningful and accurate in-kind service products.

21) It would be beneficial to have the RRC process come to closure prior to the completion of the PSP. We had a large study (e.g., 50 million dollar) that took over one year to complete. The completion of the Recon phase was held up due to the time needed to complete the PSP.

22) I do not believe a separate phase is wise since it would increase the time required to complete Recon and the PSP. However, completing a significant portion of the PSP prior to the RRC, receiving approval of the reconnaissance, and then finalizing the PSP and getting its approval makes sense.

23) This is happening now. The PSP is revised to incorporate issues from the RRC and local sponsors comments. However, this process is taking a year to complete. Possibly, we could designate a PSP negotiation phase after the RRC phase is completed.

24) This has already typically happened in our district since the RRC has raised issues that had to be addressed in the PSP. We still would need to think about PSP during the Recon phase. A rough draft PSP or a conceptual framework should be addressed before the RRC to avoid losing consistency among team members.

25) I do not think this is a good idea. This would constrain the feasibility stage. The PSP is a living document that should be subject to change as the feasibility stage occurs so findings from feasibility can be incorporated with the study framework outlined in the PSP. The PSP should contain the objective and criteria for the study, along with policy issues.

26) The PSP is currently submitted in a rough draft form along with the Recon report. It usually takes 3 months from the submittal of the Recon report to receive review comments. During this time the PSP is improved from the rough draft sent along with the Recon report. Developing a Recon report and a full blown PSP at the same time is nearly impossible.

27) This makes sense. Often in the process local political changes can change the interest and focus of the sponsor or issues raised at the RRC can also change local sponsor interest/focus.

Q4. Almost half of the mail survey respondents indicated that the parts of the PSP related to their technical disciplines are developed by the study manager. At the same time, the majority of respondents indicated that they were always given an opportunity to provide input into PSP development. Does this imply that study managers often prepare a first draft and then request input from the technical experts? How are PSPs really developed? How should they be developed?

**Almost half of the mail survey respondents indicated that the parts of the PSP related to their technical disciplines are developed by the study manager. At the same time, the majority of respondents indicated that they were always given an opportunity to provide input into PSP development. Does this imply that study managers often prepare a first draft and then request input from the technical experts?**

1) This is usually personality driven. If the study manager feels they have a solid background in all project related technical areas they may complete a majority of the PSP. In other cases a team approach is used. It depends on the study manager.

2) Yes. It is easier for a draft PSP to be drafted by the study manager and have the rough draft distributed to the technical experts for their approval. The study manager is the initial contact point with the sponsor and knows what their needs are.

3) To some respect.

4) Yes. The study manager generally develops an overall objective of the study and the alternatives to be investigated. These are developed with information from the sponsor if the study is cost shared.

5) We use a teamwork approach in the Portland district. If anything, the study manager only staples the technical experts PSP portions.

6) The study manager has a general idea/outline for the PSP and has the technical experts provide input into the cost and time for completing the study.

7) I know of one other Corps District Planning Division representative that prefers to prepare the PSP in this manor. In other words, prepare the first-cut or draft PSP, then have some other disciplines react to it. The rationale with this approach is the Planning Division sets funding limits, if only in an indirect manor. However, with the preparation of the one PSP and previous IPMPs I have worked on, I tasked representatives from other disciplinary areas to prepare respective sections of the PSP. I have the technical experts write up the part of the PSP that is pertinent to their respective areas. I then review and incorporate these parts into the PSP. The study manager utilizing this format needs to outline the format process and make sure all other workers use this format. This approach usually takes a little longer to finalize.

8) From my experience this was not the case. However, this may be the case for small studies where the study manager first develops the draft and sends it around for comments.

9) Historically, the study manager specified the needs of a study and this did not promote buy in. We have been moving over the last few years to getting technical input up-front. This has moved us from working in a vacuum to seeing how we all fit into the big picture.

10) This depends on the study manager.

11) No

### **How are PSPs really developed?**

1) We use a team driven approach. The project manager is responsible for assuring the team completes their part.

2) The PSP is first drafted by the study manager and it is then passed to the technical experts for their review and comments.

3) What really happens is the study manager requests the technical areas to prepare the portion of the PSP that pertain to their area. Then the study manager compiles these parts into a PSP. The study manager often will embellish on what is needed and complete the packaging of the PSP prior to submitting it to HQ. Conversely, the study manager may modify the cost estimates and the scope of the various parts to align these with reality. The PSP, though, typically maintains the main theme of the parts the technical area prepared.

4) I am the study manager and I develop a PSP along with alternatives and have the technical experts provide feedback on the PSP. We would spin our wheels if we did not do it in this manner.

5) A teamwork approach.

6) We have the study manager develop the framework or outline for the PSP and have the technical experts fill in the blanks.

7) No reply

8) In our example, each workgroup developed the PSP for their area. Primarily they develop the technical writeup and cost element and the network might be developed by the study manager.

9) The PSPs are now being developed with input from the technical areas, their input is consolidated into a PSP, and a draft PSP containing all technical area input is sent to the technical people for their review and to see how their work fits in with other work.

10) The study manager tasks the technical members to do the portion of the PSP that relates to their technical discipline. The study manager typically gives examples for the technical personnel to follow. People often react better to an example than developing their part first hand. The study and project managers also develop parts of the PSP.

11) The technical experts provide the primary input from their area into the PSP. Because of time constraints involving Recon work and work with the PSP, initial PSP efforts provided by the technical experts are not in a good state. The study manager must compile these efforts and apply editorial work to make the technical portions consistent. This involves the addition and subtraction from the technical submissions. The key factor is the technical areas provide the primary input into the PSP and the study manager edits them.

### **How should they be developed?**

1) The team should develop the PSP. Each functional chief is responsible for making sure their area is performing as expected and ultimately that the product gets out the door.

2) Having the study manager develop the first draft has worked for me. I believe this is the only way it can be accomplished. If the technical elements are tasked to develop the PSP from scratch, they have no starting point or idea of the scope and the provided draft PSP gives them direction.

3) From my experience this approach has worked. We would always set out a path of what will be done in a study even without a requirement from HQ.

4) By the study manager first and have the technical experts provide input.

5) A teamwork approach is required and the study manager needs to play an important role of coordinating the development of the PSP and providing the team members with the overall picture and make sure we see the goals and scope of the project.

6) In a perfect world the team develops the PSP. In reality, the process is expedited by having the study manager develop the framework for the PSP that the technical experts can use to guide them in developing their portion of the PSP.

7) The best way in my opinion is to have the technical experts develop their respective sections of the PSP to insure that their expertise is included. Everyone needs to follow the same format which is sometimes difficult to accomplish.

8) The functional area/workgroup should prepare the sections in their expertise area.

9) The method we have moved to is where the technical input is received, this is consolidated, and then the whole PSP is reviewed by the technical areas is the best method. This promotes buy in and a coordinated effort on everyone's part.

10) Ideally, the team is knowledgeable of the study and they can turn around and bullet list in a few days what is required in the study. In reality, the team members change and the new personnel have less of an understanding of the project or have had a minimal experience with the project to date. The local sponsor should also be asked to develop the portion that deals with in-kind service

11) Ideally, if the PSP was developed after submitting the Recon report, then the technical areas would be able to provide more complete and meaningful input.

Q5. A significant portion of our sample indicated that PSPs are not followed closely during the feasibility study. Why aren't they followed closely? When are they followed?

**A significant portion of our sample indicated that PSPs are not followed closely during the feasibility study. Why aren't they followed closely?**

1) The PSP is not a management tool that is taken as valuable by many study managers. It tends to be a requirement that a PSP is developed, rather than a plan that will help us get the feasibility study done. Tasks often change and there is little time to continually change PSP's.

2) The PSP is seen as something to do (i.e., a regulation) rather than a document that will assist us during feasibility.

3) A study is an evolving process. The PSP is supposed to be a living document, but in reality it is usually not modified. With a PSP we plan what to do, but we can't envision everything that will occur during feasibility. Changing the PSP to incorporate new findings that change a study causes us to deviate from what is planned and involves renegotiation with the cost sharing partner. This takes time and money.

4) The planning process is an "iterative" process that results from the evolution of the study. The focus of the project may change when the unexpected arises. For example, if an archeological investigation finds historical artifacts (i.e., arrowheads, shipwrecks) then we may have to modify the project accordingly. The problem as I see it is the guidance that was developed to guide the development of PSPs was created by those using a military philosophy. In this scenario, project planning is very straightforward. It is easy, for example, to plan for the development of a family housing project where an endpoint is well defined. In contrast, a civil works planning philosophy recognizes that unexpected realities arise. For example, during a feasibility study the unexpected, such as a significant archeological find or an environmental impact may occur, and this will probably cause modification of the project. Thus guidance that is developed under a military philosophy is not compatible with a typical civil works project.

5) I have 2 reasons. The first is that the PSP is viewed as a paper exercise for upward reporting to HQ. The attitudes at HQ need to change to recognize that a PSP is tool to help manage a study for a local sponsor and is not a document to educate the folks at HQ. Second, the PSP is not viewed as a tool for managing the feasibility study since the PSPs are currently done at a level above which managers need or would use to manage a study.

6) We tend to follow PSPs closely. However, other areas such as engineering tend to change their mind too much and this affects our work.

7) The typical situation in the Corps is that the higher ups look at a PSP as how you must do the study, rather than viewing the PSP as a living document that guides the study. A feasibility study is a discovery process where things change and we must deviate at times from the PSP accordingly.

8) By the time we get into feasibility the PSP tends to be out of date. The process of developing and reviewing the PSP takes time and this decreases the amount of the PSP that remains valid and useful. Thus, the review and approval process fosters making the PSP become outdated.

9) They are not followed closely under the following conditions: 1) a change in personnel doing the work due to other commitments, 2) change in the scope of the project resulting from changes in hydrology or other functions which are done early on which from our experience a hydrologic analysis change has resulted in scope changes early- an example is an Espanola study where the hydrology significantly reduced project study scope and study costs, and 3) Change in regulations requiring more analysis after the PSP, specifically risk analysis requirements have increased the economic and Hydrology and Hydraulics workload. In some cases the requirements were identified prior to the agreement, however personnel had little experience with them, such that time and cost estimates were not accurate. In another case, the requirements were added after the PSP, changing the workload required. I do not see a remedy for any one of these conditions, and if the original PSP is documented as best as possible at the time, the basis for any changes is evident to both internal and external customers

10) The PSP requires detail in excess of what is needed to guide the feasibility study. It becomes a document that is not useful to the districts to manage a feasibility study. The majority of the PSP seems to be information that is included just to help HQ understand the study/project. We have to use day to day judgement on what work needs to be performed based on the mix of people available and the timeframe. Developing a detailed plan that addresses what we will do 1-3 years from now is not practical. We need to know what the study will address and the sequence of steps to take to get the work accomplished based on our best judgement up-front of what will occur. However, we cannot predict the exact date or personnel that will work on a task. The PSP is a living document that is subject to change and should be taken as such.

11) The PSPs tend not to be thought out well enough and we may overlook some items that may arise during feasibility. We usually are constrained in developing a PSP due to the fact that they are developed near the end of the Recon phase when our budget is limited and we have little time left to develop it. This causes the PSP not to be taken seriously.

12) They are not because we are trying to get real work done and the PSP is only paper work at this time.

13) This is partially caused by studies taking a long time to complete and personnel changes that occur during this time. New personnel that are assigned to work on the study may not be familiar with the PSP or no of its existence. Additionally, after the study starts people believe they know what to do and do not believe they need to use the PSP.

14) The schedule outlined in the PSP can change due to field conditions and the availability of personnel to complete the assigned tasks. There is not a direct link among work schedules of other projects. A program such as MS Project may help the teamwork of the project.

15) The team members are a knowledgeable group that is able to get the work done and most of our work is done in house. We primarily use the schedule part of the PSP and coordinate weekly to assess the schedule.

16) Mainly because the PSPs are relatively new plans. From my experience, the quality of PSPs have increased as our experience with developing them has increased. They are becoming more detailed with more activities becoming incorporated into the plans and we have been able to incorporate lessons learned from previous PSPs. For example, scheduling has improved as our experience with PSP development has increased. The early PSPs did not contain enough detail and recognition of the interdependencies among activities. As a result, all the predecessor and successor tasks were not adequately defined. General comments from my perspective: Early on, the emphasis to accelerate our study process led to unrealistic schedules. Those schedules required all District elements to begin their work almost simultaneously. The schedules were very compressed. However, all activities cannot begin at the same time. Many can, but some must be completed before others can begin. For example, design cannot efficiently proceed before geotechnical, environmental and cultural work is done because any requirement to avoid a particular area or provide for mitigation needs to be incorporated into the design process. Real estate requirements are totally dependent on the results of the same tests and design, which means that completing the REP has to be one of the final activities of the feasibility process. Although design and real estate can perform some of the background mapping and preparatory work, the final product cannot be completed until all necessary contributing data is available. Our feasibility study process has a default time and cost because of the regulations and public laws that must be met. The requirements for a feasibility study are fixed and the methods to complete them are well defined. We cannot expect to shorten the time or lessen the cost much more unless we change the requirements.

17) In reality, the study develops a life of its own and the level of effort required for each task may change.

18) It depends on the study time frame and what the sponsor wants. Also, during the feasibility phase, things that were not anticipated arise and can change the scope. The PSP should be viewed as a living document, rather than a static plan. In my opinion, a PSP can be viewed as something that if given to a consultant the work can be accomplished (i.e., the costs and product relationship is addressed).

19) The PSP in my view is a living document and is subject to change based on findings from the feasibility stage.

20) The intent is to follow the PSP, but the study causes deviation from the PSP. The PSP should be regarded as a living document.

### **When are they followed?**

1) The dollar amounts laid out in the PSP are followed closely since this is a commitment. During a feasibility study we find from our data analysis that some areas require more work and others less. This just makes parts of the PSP invalid. The PSP needs to be flexible and easily changed. The tasks change during a feasibility study but the allocated dollars are followed.

- 2) It is up to project/study manager to provide leadership that the PSP is important to the project and for it to drive the study process.
- 3) I do not get to see if we were able to do all that was set out for in the PSP. I am in a technical area and the study manager may know when they are followed.
- 4) Probably the simpler the project, the more they are followed closely. In addition, the will of the study manager dictates how closely the project is followed.
- 5) The PSP is followed closely for the developed milestones. It is also followed closely for really tight activities and when sponsors are very concerned about an activity.
- 6) We tend to follow PSPs closely.
- 7) We try to follow the PSP as closely as possible since it is a mutually agreed upon plan between the Corps and the local sponsor. However, all must recognize that the PSP is a living document and deviation from it will probably occur.
- 8) If the schedule and functional task elements do not slip then they are followed.
- 9) From our perspective (Econ and H&H) they have been followed closely and have been a vital tool and good argument basis when we must deviate from our plan.
- 10) There are parts of the PSP that are followed closely. The types of activities we must do and the dollars allocated are followed closely.
- 11) Not sure.
- 12) They are followed only when the project sponsor requires us to follow it closely or when higher up officials at HQ want us to follow it closely.
- 13) This depends on the study manager or project manager. When they do not believe in the PSP, the PSP is probably not followed closely.
- 14) The milestones are followed closely. They are also followed closely when a sequence of events requires the input of one technical area for another.
- 15) A PSP may be followed more closely if we use outside contracting.
- 16) PSPs are becoming increasingly used more often to detail the relationship between what needs to occur before other tasks can proceed. For, example engineering and planning data is needed before real estate can proceed with some tasks. When all players understand the relationship/timeline of the feasibility study, coordinated efforts among the players improves. In addition, when the relationships are adequately defined and the project is properly scoped.
- 17) We follow the general framework of the PSP.

18) For example, with our channel deepening study, we finalized Recon in 91 and it took until 94 to finalize the PSP. By that time we had addressed and anticipated what should occur during the feasibility stage and it should be able to be followed closely. However, I reiterate that the PSP should be viewed as living document that sets the framework, but items that arise during feasibility may make deviating from the PSP necessary.

19) During the second phase of feasibility the PSP tends to be followed more closely since we have a better understanding of what is required.

20) It depends with the preparation of the PSP. If done well, they can be followed more closely. They are followed more closely when the scopes are very complete.

Q6. Most of the survey sample did not feel that PSPs had eliminated the need for work requests. Why haven't PSPs been able to eliminate the need for work requests?

**Most of the survey sample did not feel that PSPs had eliminated the need for work requests. Why haven't PSPs been able to eliminate the need for work requests?**

1) Not sure

2) We do not use work requests per say. We use the PSP to informally identify what work needs to be done and by what technical area the work needs to be done. The task assignments as outlined in the PSP will change as the study progresses.

3) This is a function of habit, it has always been done this way. In some offices a work request is required. Other offices do not require a work request.

4) It is difficult to fully know when things required to proceed with a study become available (i.e., data) and the workload or simultaneously occurring studies/projects also dictate the availability of personnel. Further, studies typically do not go as planned and alternatives may come into play with a study.

5) The project management system is set up poorly as the project manager has no authority. While the division chiefs have the authority to decide to recognize or not recognize the schedule outlined in the PSP. The PSP schedule is not felt as a commitment and a memo with cost codes is needed to request personnel to perform work during the feasibility study.

6) A cultural change is needed since work requests are not needed. Some personnel still require a work request. While a memo is sufficient for others.

7) Because in our district, each office still requires a formal paper work request along with cost codes and when the work is needed. We take the WBS from the PSP and attach it to the work request.

8) We still are required by divisions/branches to formally request in writing what work is needed.

9) The biggest part of the problem is during the 2nd and 3rd years of a study, people lose sight of what they previously agreed to do. Also staff changes and priorities can change as the study gets in the latter stages.

10) The main reason is the PSP becomes outdated and they no longer are a useful document to follow and work requests are needed.

11) The work requests are still required, because even though the PSP has the schedule, the technical elements do not review it on a regular basis. The technical manager or project manager is responsible for notifying the proper channels about the need for future work.

- 12) If we want technical work we need to send a memo requesting work because funding is not always available as planned for in the PSP schedule.
- 13) The work request system is well established and is a different system than the PSP system. We need to provide documentation requesting work along with the costs associated with the work. The PSP provides an outline of the overall work and detail. The cost and tracking responsibility requires a work request to be issued.
- 14) We still are using work requests, but the request is primarily a function of duplicating information already contained in the PSP. There are times when people who initially were to work on a project are no longer available so a work request is needed to obtain these personnel.
- 15) We do not require a formal writeup requesting personnel to perform work. We have a project team that is created at the beginning of a study and other division members are included on the team. The meetings help guide when work is needed and by whom. When priority problems arise the team decides the allocation of the work with direction by higher level managers.
- 16) Not sure. This does not have a big impact on us. We tend to do 90 percent of the work in house. If we use a contractor, we typically need 30 days at a minimum to acquire their services.
- 17) Most of our work is completed in house.
- 18) PSPs are big and broad and do not have the detail that is required to identify specific work that is required of individuals. The work request is a specific request of what we want from a district and when. Also, in big projects the PSP needs to be kept current and updated so we know what is required.
- 19) They have reduced work request in the Portland office since we have included with the PSP the work requirements of personnel in the feasibility study.
- 20) We still need some mechanism to request the functional chiefs to schedule people according to this request and other projects their personnel are involved with.
- 21) At the technical side, the PSP is developed one year or more before funding is allocated and we must wait for funding to proceed. When the funding arrives, we then need to have personnel made aware of the tasks that need to be worked on at when they need to be addressed.
- 22) We often have a cover your butt mentality and offices are often in rivalry with other offices and a blame game occurs. The formal paper work request is used to protect one from blame.
- 23) We use an informal basis for work requests rather than a formal method using paper for the request. However, funding and other projects that are occurring simultaneously require some mechanism to coordinate personnel to work on a study at a given time. Further, study delays and funding constraints impact when the personnel are needed in comparison to the schedule outlined in the PSP.

24) They should have eliminated the need for work requests. We have no need for work requests with the meetings we have and by monitoring the key milestones. The manager is the responsible party for keeping people in line and informed about work requirements. The need for work requests may be a requirement of the technical disciplines. Since we are no longer working in a vacuum, hopefully we are getting away from work requests.

25) It depends on the district. There is a tendency for division chiefs to require a work request if they are pushed to do work they would rather not be involved with. Also, for protective reasons a work request is often wanted to document a request to eliminate the possibility of work not being performed and the reply that we never were asked to do the work. We use e-mail as an informal method to document work requests.

26) The district technical personnel work on a day to day basis and the PSP is set up as a long term perspective of work that is needed.

27) It is hard to keep track of multiple studies that are occurring simultaneously. Thus, a study manager needs to remind the proper channels of personnel that are required for a given portion of a feasibility study.

28) Individuals have not been told or do not recognize that PSPs are a contract that they agreed to.

29) This is a complicated issue. Fundamentally, when the PSP is developed and funding approval has occurred, we do not get the total amount requested due to savings/slippage. The difference in funding required and allocated to us must then be made up in the different technical functions of the study. This can alter the schedule and level of detail we can investigate in the study. So a work request is needed to address the deviation from the PSP. In addition, a work request also documents the work at an individual level.

Q7. A sizable portion of the survey respondents did not believe that PSPs had improved coordination among the people assigned to work on the feasibility studies. What do you think caused the respondents to believe that PSPs have not been able to cultivate coordination among work elements?

**A sizable portion of the survey respondents did not believe that PSPs had improved coordination among the people assigned to work on the feasibility studies. What do you think caused the respondents to believe that PSPs have not been able to cultivate coordination among work elements?**

1) This probably varies by the district. Our coordination is developed through team meetings. The study manager monitors that the work is being performed. In our office most of the areas that work on a given study are in the same organizational branch. The attitudes of the people matters in developing and maintaining communication.

2) It is not the PSP that causes a lack of coordination, rather it is the leadership of the study manager that drives coordination.

3) The document does not cause the coordination. It is the people who work on a feasibility study (i.e., study manager, study team, technical manager) that make coordination a reality. Institutionalizing the process and group feedback make coordination occur.

4) Before we developed PSPs, we always developed schedules. The PSP schedule or schedules completed under other plans with different names are similar. The coordination would be fully realized if the division chiefs would see the PSP as a binding agreement that they enter into with the allocation of personnel in accordance with the schedule.

5) There are 2 reasons. The first occurs when the PSP is developed by section chiefs and the buy-in of the plan by the technical areas does not occur. The second reason occurs from PSPs that take a long time to develop (i.e., 6-8 months). During this time frame the PSP staff may change.

6) The PSP does not provide a mechanism for coordination. Team meetings are the method to provide the coordination. The managers carry out the requirements for the study. The network developed in the PSP is the guts for us to follow.

7) The PSP is looked upon as a managerial gimmick and not taken seriously. As said earlier, it is put together under a limited budget and time frame. The time to develop the PSP is limited. This fosters the PSP to be looked down at. This may relate to the Corps in general in that interoffice communication is lacking and each office tends to have its own area they try to protect. We tend to worry about our backside, rather than the product.

8) There are two factors that work here. First, a good study team is vital and the interrelationships among them. Second, the PSP appears to be an upward reporting tool for higher management.

9) The PSP does not insure there is team work. The PSP is like a contract, but it does not guarantee buy-in. If the division chiefs do not get along, then there is a lack of coordination. If the personalities of all parties involved in a project are compatible, coordination is high.

10) The PSPs are put in a file and not looked at again after completed. This causes people to forget what is in them and this reduces the coordination among key personnel involved with a feasibility study. The PSP should be used to monitor where we are and where we are going.

11) People do not read it. They prepare the section that pertains to their area and typically only use that section. They depend on the study manager to inform them with what needs to be done.

12) I disagree somewhat with this. It does not matter what you call it (i.e., PSP or IPMP) since philosophically it is a plan of execution. Studies are a discovery process and not like the construction of a brickwall where it is easy to determine the number of bricks needed and the personnel required to build the wall. Studies often cause a reinvention of what we will further do. For example, what we find out during the study may not be what we anticipated and this will cause us to deviate from how we set out to do the study. In our analysis, level of analysis, and alternatives we investigate change. The key to a successful study is the communication and collaboration among all players in the study. We need a roadmap to follow but not to the detail level that vast administrative resources are exhausted in keeping the PSP updated.

Q8. Almost one-quarter of respondents did not feel that their districts' leadership had a positive and supportive view of PSPs. Why do you think that the leadership in some districts do not have a supportive view of PSPs? How does this lack of positive support present itself?

**Almost one-quarter of respondents did not feel that their districts' leadership had a positive and supportive view of PSPs. Why do you think that the leadership in some districts do not have a supportive view of PSPs?**

1) Again, the PSP is seen as something to do, a regulation, and is not a key element in the process.

2) Our district does have a supportive view. However, upper level management may not fully read a PSP. In addition, some team members may only read the part of the PSP that pertains to their area and other team members read all of the PSP.

3) Some districts may not have gone through the review process with the latest guidelines and understanding of PSP requirements. The detail level HQ wants in the PSP does not provide us with the flexibility that is needed in the PSP.

4) The PSP is not useful beyond the network which I am very supportive of. We need a work plan to use, but not a PSP in the form currently required.

5) This is difficult for me to say why this is. It could vary by the product. When deadlines slip, management places greater emphasis on P&S and DM's. The leadership gives higher regard to plan specifications and design memos, than feasibility or Recon studies.

6) The leadership may not be involved to a great degree with the PSP process or the study. Their concern would be that the work is done on time and schedule, rather than worrying about the PSP.

7) There is a tendency on some peoples part to not want to commit themselves. They may think the PSP is a tool to be used against them in judging their effectiveness in the feasibility study.

**How does this lack of positive support present itself?**

1) Not sure

2) I believe they have a positive view of PSPs.

3) In the Walla Walla District the district leadership is supportive.

4) We think of the PSP as a HQ requirement.

5) They come across as supportive of PSPs, but place greater emphasis on plan specifications and design memos than earlier reports or studies.

6) They may not pay attention to the PSP, may not emphasize its importance, or totally ignore it.

7) If a person views the PSP as a living document then these people may have a more favorable opinion of PSPs.

Q9. The majority of mail survey respondents felt that the costs of PSPs are not offset by savings during the feasibility study? Why do you believe this belief is so prevalent?

**The majority of mail survey respondents felt that the costs of PSPs are not offset by savings during the feasibility study. Why do you believe this belief is so prevalent?**

1) It is difficult to estimate cost savings without an evaluation mechanism to monitor the cost of a study completed with and without a PSP and if quality was different between the studies.

2) The PSP is something that is produced and not really used, thus PSP developmental costs are not realized during the feasibility stage.

3) We spend time developing the PSP and must still fulfill the requirements for the study. For example, we still must spend the time conducting the feasibility study along with all the requirements (i.e., environmental impacts and archeological investigation). The guidance provided by ASA and HQ is conflicting. We have guidance that specifies we should reduce the time and cost of conducting a project. While at the same time, we have additional guidance and requirements at the technical offices that we must address such as technical review that the districts are to now prepare.

4) We spend numerous resources developing PSPs in a time that FTEs are declining. As a study progresses the design, project size, and project effort change resulting in some cases from study findings. Costs associated with developing a PSP are then not realized from a plan developed for the initial method to attack the study.

5) Not sure.

6) Because we spend from 100,000 to 300,000 dollars to develop a PSP depending on the study. This is a vast amount of resources when compared to a project that takes 2 million dollars to complete. Thus it is tough to recoup the costs of the PSP when you spend a high percent of the total project costs on the PSP. Also things change from the detail contained in the PSP, so dollars spent on documenting this detail is not realized when you never perform the work due to deviations.

7) The problem I have is even though the PSP is beneficial, I believe HQ does not understand the dollars and time that goes into the development of a PSP. Less complex projects do not need PSPs that are high in detail.

8) From our experience we put a great amount of effort into the development of a PSP. Planning guides the development of PSPs in our area and they request our input into the estimated dollars it would take to perform the work. From the sum of the estimate generated for technical areas, we may find it takes 4 million to do the work, but we are told only 2.3 million is available. We must then go back and find ways to cut costs by reducing the level of detail and removing areas to investigate. This iterative process increases the cost of the study. The cost savings issue also correlates with the work included in the feasibility study. In some cases, the feasibility is combined with a design memorandum so we can go directly into plans and specifications. In

other cases we do just the feasibility effort. When combined with a DM, it is very difficult to come up with study efforts and PSP input because we do not know what the final plan actually is but we do have to make a work effort estimate for it. As I have mentioned, we sometimes use the results of the Recon as the assumed final plan for the feasibility phase. This thinking is a little backwards but that is how we do it.

9) When we do a study, there are many unknowns and scientific discoveries that make deviation from the PSP necessary. Also, the public involvement process molds the study. Thus, the time and detail that is addressed in the PSP is probably lost as the study progresses. A factor of reality were the best laid out plans will still need modification due to study findings and public input.

10) The PSP costs money to develop and we receive little added value from its development at the district level since it is not a useful tool for the most part at the district.

11) The PSP comes at a high cost (i.e., 60-100 K dollars). We can not realize savings of this magnitude when the PSP only results in small efficiencies from schedule coordination. Also, rework in the study results from findings in the feasibility study and a PSP has no relationship to unexpected study savings.

12) It is a tough task to develop and negotiate a PSP. The new guidance indicates that a PSP is a contract that the sponsor, district, and HQ agrees to. Some savings may result from the recognition of the PSP as a formal contract in that if something is agreed to (e.g., 10 soil borings), then additional work cannot be done unless all agree to it. In reality though, people may try to cover all the bases by trying to include all possible needed study data and analysis and build these into the PSP, when possibly not needed. In the regard that HQ uses a PSP to justify their job by second guessing us.

13) The PSP is felt by many as an additional item to the process and some may regard it as not necessary. The process may also be perceived as working before the advent of PSPs. People may not yet be convinced of the need for PSPs.

14) The cost of the PSP is off-set during the feasibility study if the PSP is done right.

Q10. Sixty-four percent of the mail survey responses indicated that project sponsors are often confused by PSPs. What is the reason(s) for the confusion? Is the problem the PSP or with the general level of expertise of sponsors?

**Sixty-four percent of the mail survey responses indicated that project sponsors are often confused by PSPs. What is the reason(s) for the confusion?**

- 1) The PSP is a complex document that contains much info in the scopes and it is difficult for the sponsor to understand some of the work that is necessary.
- 2) The jargon the Corps uses is part of the problem. We also develop a PSP in mind that it is sent to HQ for their approval and may overlook the sponsors ability to understand the PSP. The sponsor is not familiar with all of the Corps requirements. Sometimes we are just plain arrogant with the attitude we know what needs to be done.
- 3) The change of the name of the plan from the IPMP to finally PSP has lead to some confusion. The level of detail may also be more than the sponsor has time to look at.
- 4) The sponsor may desire to perform some work, however, regulations may prevent the sponsor from perform this work.
- 5) There are 2 reasons. The first occurs when the sponsor does not fully understand the process requirements that we must address to satisfy congress. Second, the way our organization is set up is different from the way the local sponsor is set up. An education process with the local sponsor is a must.
- 6) The sponsor often does not see the need for a PSP. The technical manger or the project manager is responsible for educating the sponsor about the schedule, activities, and cost and why they are such. The sponsor may not be familiar with the requirements on part of the federal government. A sponsor pamphlet explaining the PSP requirement, its detail, and usefulness would be helpful.
- 7) We use our own language and acronyms in the Corps.
- 8) The local sponsor does not have a good concept of why the PSP is needed and in fact gets very turned off to it since they often view it as not needed and see little value added benefit from it. Also, the Corps is notorious for using acronyms that are not understandable to the sponsor
- 9) The detail contained in the PSP is greater than the sponsor needs or has time to review. The sponsor may not see the relationship between the PSP and the study.
- 10) A lot of this deals with the way it is presented since the PSP is developed by many offices and the study manager does not take the time to edit the PSP before it is given to the local sponsor. If the local sponsor has an engineering background as recently occurred with a project, they question the need for our numerous levels of management. They are also not quite sure of

what we will accomplish as outlined in the PSP. The sponsors may also think we are inefficient given our levels of management.

11) The PSP contains vast volumes of information on dollars and hours involved with tasks and it lacks a general discussion of what we are doing, why we are doing things, and how we will complete the study. A general discussion is more valuable to a sponsor than a detailed listing of dollars and hours involved with tasks.

12) The level of detail that is included in the PSP and the discussion of detail could go beyond what the sponsor can understand. However, this varies by project in that some sponsors have the ability to understand the PSP.

13) The sponsors are on a learning curve with the PSP. Also, they do not always understand the requirements that we must live by. The way the Corps does business and the way a local sponsor does business are typically not the same and this causes confusion.

14) The size of the PSP might be overwhelming for the sponsor and they get lost in the process. They also may not fully understand the study process or the factors that are involved with the study process. Sponsors may also not see themselves as playing a major role in the process.

15) The PSP includes too much information. This provides the local sponsor the opportunity to argue if 10 or 12 hours are needed for an activity. We would be better off having the PSP contain the big picture (i.e., planning will do various tasks at a total cost for these tasks). The terminology we use is also confusing to the sponsor. The sponsor may also worry that the PSP is inflexible if we do not document, for example, we will hold monthly program meetings.

16) From my experience the sponsors have not had much confusion. This has resulted for 2 reasons. First, the sponsors I have been involved with have had a suitable background to understand the PSP and what is needed in the study. Second, I educate the sponsor on the PSP areas of primary significance to them. I have the sponsor pay closer attention to the scope, cost, and schedule elements of the PSP.

17) The local sponsors we have dealt with have varied in their water resource analysis understanding. They may not fully understand what questions need to be addressed and the analysis needed to answer the question. The sponsor may look at the PSP and become overwhelmed with the majority of it, while others have difficulty understanding portions of the PSP (i.e., economic analysis). Education is important between the sponsor and the Corps. This is a two way street where they learn the requirements we must live by and how we answer the questions and we learn what the sponsors' needs are.

### **Is the problem the PSP or with the general level of expertise of sponsors?**

1) The technical aptitude of the sponsor is often limited. We are the technical experts and they accept what we believe is required for the study.

- 2) Primarily with the level of expertise, the PSP is a Corps requirement. Some sponsors have the expertise needed to understand the project, others do not.
- 3) The acronyms in the PSP are the most confusing to the sponsor. For example, one PSP I seen was loaded with acronyms and the sponsor could not fully understand the PSP until they were spelled out. Also, we put the part that the sponsor is responsible for in italics so they can easily find the areas they need to address.
- 4) The expertise level of the sponsor may be lacking.
- 5) The expertise level of the sponsor is the cause, especially when they do not have the sophistication to understand the PSP. I see 2 situations occurring with local sponsors that have a limited expertise understanding: 1) they try to understand all the detail included in the PSP and get very lost or 2) the sponsor just trusts our expertise.
- 6) I do not believe this is the case. The PSP in itself should not be a highly technical document and should be understandable to the sponsor.
- 7) This is the Corps problem in our ability to communicate to the sponsor/customer.
- 8) This relates to the level of expertise on part of the sponsor.
- 9) The expertise of the sponsor can be a problem with their aptitude to understand a PSP. Also, the sponsor may not understand the way the Corps does business and what is required to do a study and get it approved. The PSP needs to focus on products. The sponsor is more interested in products than they are on the detail of developing the products. The Corps wants to develop an array of alternatives and in many instances some of these alternatives are not reasonable nor can they be implemented. Some individuals at HQ simply want to see a large array of alternatives, not necessarily valid alternatives.
- 10) Not with the sponsors we have currently dealt with. They have had an excellent understanding of engineering. The PSP has been put together with little editing of the individual portions submitted from the technical areas.
- 11) Deals with the level of detail included in the PSP.
- 12) The problem is with the sophistication of the sponsor and with the rules and regulations that govern what the Corps can and can not do.
- 13) It is a systematic problem where we often do business differently.
- 14) The level of expertise is the primary reason for their confusion.
- 15) It depends on the level of sophistication of the sponsor.
- 16)The problem relates to the presentation of the PSP and the sophistication of the sponsor.

17) The problem primarily deals with the sponsors understanding of what we must do. In an analogy to total quality management where the customer defines the quality we should deliver, we can not operate in this fashion since we must address federal stewardship regulations. Under federal stewardship we must determine if the project is of both federal and local interest. We cannot spend funds for totally local interest projects.

Q11. The majority of our sample believed that PSPs make districts and team members more accountable for study schedule and budget. However, over 40 percent of the sample believe that this increase in accountability comes at the direct expense of product quality. How does the requirement for PSPs reduce study quality? What would it take to improve study quality?

**The majority of our sample believed that PSPs make districts and team members more accountable for study schedule and budget. However, over 40 percent of the sample believe that this increase in accountability comes at the direct expense of product quality. How does the requirement for PSPs reduce study quality?**

1) The dollar resources used to document changes in the PSP that occur as the study progresses. We focus on maintaining the schedule.

2) The PSP shouldn't reduce study quality. Rather, quality should improve as a result of it.

3) This relates to the funding that we believe is required to do the work and the funding that is actually allocated to perform the work. For example, if we need 100 K to do the work and only 50 K is authorized, we must cut the level of detail required or areas investigated. Thus, something suffers such as product quality.

4) The PSP sets up the study schedule and costs. Study findings typically cause a shift in the direction we take to answer a study problem. Since we are held accountable for schedule and costs as outlined in the PSP, deviations from the PSP puts us under fire.

5) I do not think it actually has reduced study quality. In fact study quality may have increased since we know the time and money resources we have to work with. If quality is decreased it would result from the tight schedule we are working under. The data that we receive or need may not be of sufficient quality and a tight schedule does not allow us to obtain better data. If we miss the schedule we will mess up the schedule for another technical area.

6) The PSP makes us look at the bottom line, rather than looking at the product as a product. We place greater emphasis on design, cost, and performance of the project rather than the getting the product done right. I still hear upper management say we can fix it in the next phase. We are constrained by following a set budget and timeframe.

7) The PSP does not reduce study quality. Study quality is the same whether we have a PSP or not.

8) Issues often arise that require us to deviate from the schedule and budget outlined in the PSP. However, there is an emphasis on meeting the schedule or budget and quality issues may be sacrificed to meet the schedule and budget.

9) We tend to focus on end-dates in the Corps. Thus tasks are sometimes completed with the anticipation that they will be fixed latter. We do not focus enough on the start date.

10) I do not believe study quality has decreased. The cost of conducting the study may have increased.

11) There is a trade-off between quality and time/dollars. The emphasis is on adherence to time rather than quality.

12) It has focused us more towards the budget and schedule and we may not change from what is presented in the PSP even when study findings say we should. When the budget is set in stone and additional funding is not possible, corners have to be cut and quality usually suffers because we are judged less in this area.

### **What would it take to improve study quality?**

1) Too often we try to use a fine tooth comb to cover all bases even when the study may only need a broad based plan.

2) Not applicable

3) Allocation of the funding that is needed to perform all necessary work.

4) The PSP needs to be flexible enough to account for study findings that require us to shift direction in the schedule and tasks. PSP flexibility needs to be understood.

5) Communication with other parties that need data is critical if we find that the data we have or received has problems. Inform others about bad data and having project meetings at least on a monthly schedule should help avoid decreasing the study quality. We have been having frequent meetings in recent times and this has helped.

6) We need to go with a team type design that brings us together. The managers need to give us the room needed to complete the study when we understand the dollars and time available to get the product out. In addition, we are told we should try to work like a private organization. But as a public organization, a reward system is necessary to develop a philosophy compatible to private industry.

7) The study manager must play a greater role in the study and help team members to understand the scope and goals of the project.

8) The reconnaissance phase is vital to developing a worthwhile and reliable PSP.

9) I think we focus too much on completion dates and not enough on start dates. The old saying that the works expands to fit the time seems to be true. The problem is that someone's slip causes someone else hardship. Any slippage early in the schedule has a ripple effect throughout the rest of the schedule. For those offices whose tasks occur at or near the end of the study, the problem is particularly annoying. But, the completion date has to be met, so get something out and worry about fixing it latter. Some personnel, not myself, are being rated on meeting completion dates. This is a negative incentive to produce a quality product. Meeting a completion date is an easily

definable goal for the rater; judging a quality product is not. I believe another impediment to producing a quality product is trying to track every penny. I personally spend too much of my time worrying about if the MODS were exceeded this month, or if another District element spent my money because it all rolls up into one account. The costs are taken by timekeeper number and my timekeeper is dead last. So, even if I've been allocated funds and I know from my Program Analyst that we have not exceeded the allocation, I do not always know if the account is good. Give me the money I asked for to complete the tasks I have identified and leave me to do the work.

10) Not applicable

11) Better communication in-house and less second guessing by the reviewers.

12) Less policy from HQ.

Q12. Over 60 percent of the mail survey respondents thought that PSPs require too much detail. What parts of the PSP require more detail than is necessary to benefit the feasibility study? How would you propose to limit the detail of the PSP, while maintaining its general purpose?

**Over 60 percent of the mail survey respondents thought t that PSPs require too much detail. What parts of the PSP require more detail than is necessary t o benefit the feasibility study?**

1) The greatest part that requires too much detail is the codes of accounts. Micro-tracking costs to a subaccount level is difficult for the sponsor to appreciate and understand. In addition, it is difficult for use to track at a micro level.

2) I am not sure they require too much detail. The team needs to develop the level of detail they think is necessary and required to manage the study effectively.

3) The level of detail causes us too get to specific and this causes the flexibility needed for feasibility to be lost. The detail in the PSP may eliminate items that arise during feasibility to be eliminated from consideration.

4) The detail anticipated in the WBS is more than is needed. We should be able to use historic data in this area. The study size and type should dictate the level of detail.

5) Not sure since I am in a technical area.

6) The PSP does not require as much detail as a PMP, as paragraph 6 of EC 1105-2-208 is doing.

7) Only the cost breakdown structure, network, and up-front portions (i.e., scope and problem statement) provide the district with value. The rest of the PSP is for the benefit of HQ.

8) The technical offices have the philosophy that they need to include a fine level of detail in the dollars associated with activities and the methods to be used. The technical offices have the philosophy that they should develop a lot of detail to justify the dollars associated with alternatives and methods to be used to develop the products for a feasibility study.

9) Not sure if the PSP requires more detail then we normally included in previous study plans.

10) The detail that requires us to specify who will exactly perform a task is too much. The individual office manager should decide who will complete a task according to available funds and personnel, rather than having this outlined in the PSP.

11) The portions dealing with the economic analysis, design and criteria, and H&H model.

12) Coming from the perspective of the technical side, the network analysis is not necessary. Micro-accounting of costs, sometimes down to the hours required to perform tasks during a given day, is overkill.

13) One area where detail can be eliminated is when tasks that are completed in sequence.

14) Not sure

15) A good write-up and examples of what is required in the study is most important. We have had difficulty when the sponsor wants to perform a high percentage of in-kind services. We have also had difficulty with budgeting for the development of the PSP when the Recon preparation costs became more than expected and a relatively large amount of time and effort is spent preparing scopes of work, reviewing proposals from and negotiating with the sponsor. This takes time.

16) The PSP does not need to have minute detail specifying the exact methods we will use during feasibility. We know what is required to answer the questions.

17) A good PSP should contain a bullet listing of the tasks in the feasibility study. There is little benefit derived by presenting individual costs of tasks in the PSP. Also, a level of detail listing the intricate workings of the methods used in the feasibility study is not needed.

18) The PSP should include the schedule, budget, and be a plan viewed as a mechanism to retain the quality of the study.

19) What parts of the PSP require more detail than is necessary to benefit the feasibility study? The PSP really only needs three items that are of importance to the study and the sponsor, the scope, cost, and schedule. These relate directly to the FCSA. The scope also needs to have a level of detail similar to the level that would be needed to send the study out for contracting.

20) The level of detail that can be presented in the work breakdown structure needs to be considered. The projects can be highly complex and we need to provide a certain amount of detail without going overboard. We should not develop the WBS to an action level. Project management tends to want a greater level of detail than the planning organization. The detail also needs to be considered in regard to the size of the project.

**How would you propose to limit the detail of the PSP, while maintaining its general purpose?**

1) It may be better to track accounts at a functional area level, rather than individual level. Tracking at a micro-level just increases the costs of the study.

2) The level of detail should vary depending on the size and complexity of the project. Thus, the level of detail needed is dictated by the need to track a study so it is accomplished on time and within budget.

3) I propose to limit a PSP to broad items to complete, rather than specific milestones to reach. Cost and schedule are important, but a micro-accounting scheme of tracking dollars encumbers the process.

4) The district should be given the task of deciding the level of detail that is required in a PSP to satisfy the customer. The level of detail required appears to be for the benefit of the reviewer at HQ so that they are able to understand the project.

5) Not sure

6) An outline for the level of detail required and limiting the detail to the size of the project would be helpful.

7) The network, cost breakdown, and scope of work with a problem statement is of value. Also, a statement of the activities we will perform along with their associated schedule and anticipated costs to document dollars allocated is needed.

8) We should focus more on the end-product we will produce and not necessarily develop a detailed roadmap. The products are what is important, not detail involved in deriving the products.

9) Not sure

10) The PSP should only have detail to the point of addressing the tasks that need to be completed and the offices that will do a task. Addressing the personnel that will perform a task is too much detail.

11) We could use prior data derived from previous studies when applicable. For example, if we have data on a 7-Eleven from Montana and we are studying a 7-Eleven in Tennessee, the data from Montana is more than likely applicable to the Tennessee study.

12) Important components of the PSP include an outline of the scope of work and technical responsibility, schedule, and budget.

13) When we provide detail we need to think about the definitive product. Currently the tasks are defined arbitrarily, when we need to define a task in regard to an interim or the final product. For example, if it takes 6 steps to develop a cost estimate for a BC, the 6 steps are not important only the cost estimate. Developing detail for each of the 6 steps is not necessary, rather detail in accordance with the final product is important.

14) Not sure, however the PSP is a management tool for a study with a cost sharing sponsor. The PSP is a framework for what is required and what can be done.

15) The detail level requirement of a PSP should be driven by the complexity of the study. For example, large and complex projects would require greater detail and effort than smaller projects. The WBS could possibly be simplified or additional guidance in preparing WBS for planning efforts is certainly needed, especially for those developing their first PSP. Good examples would help a great deal in this regard.

16) For example, just specifying what impacts and benefits will be addressed should be sufficient.

17) We need to have experienced people at HQ, who have recent experience with studies, review PSPs. They must understand the working level of detail that is realistic for a study.

18) For each project the schedule, budget, and quality issues should be addressed in the PSP. These are key issues for the PSP. It should also have policy issues addressed clearly and concisely. If the policy changes during midstream then the project can be substantially impacted.

19) First, we do not need to include in the PSP information that is already included in the Recon report. Second, the organizational breakdown of the Corps is not useful to the sponsor and is not needed in the PSP. Third, plans such as the resource plan should only be highlighted in the scope.

20) We should develop the level of detail to the size and complexity of the project and to the type of project (i.e., flood control versus environmental restoration). Model PSPs that are tailored to a specific project type would help. Here I propose that 2 model PSPs are presented for each project type and the level of detail that is required varies according to the size of the project. We need to also have some freedom to use professional judgement.

Q13. Nearly one-half of the sample did not believe that the Corps planning process had improved as a result of the requirement for PSPs. Do you believe the planning process has gotten worse than before the PSPs? What factors would lead to an improvement in the planning process, and how do these factors relate to PSPs?

**Nearly one-half of the sample did not believe that the Corps planning process had improved as a result of the requirement for PSPs. Do you believe the planning process has gotten worse than before the PSPs?**

1) I am not sure if change has occurred in the way we do things is a result of PSPs. In the past we had a technical area or group perform all necessary work for a project. Now we have many technical areas that work together with a study/project manager that oversees the work and pulls it together. The study or project manager is the key to the process when we have a fragmented system of technical areas that work on a project.

2) The PSP/IPMP is really not new. Most districts/divisions required a plan of study for all feasibility studies so only the processing and approval levels have changed. It is too early to tell if HQ approval of the PSP will result in less review comments, less rework.

3) The process has not gotten worse. It is the added work involved with most of the PSP that is not of use to the district.

4) No, but not improved either. The current method has caused us to be more concerned with the schedule and budget, than with the product itself.

5) It has not gotten worse or better. It just costs more as a result of the PSP.

6) I do not believe there has been much change. Other districts may have a different experience.

7) The PSP is a good idea in that it provides a plan of action for the feasibility study. Traditional Corps personnel may have problems with changing their ways.

8) No. Planning is more affected by policy from HQ.

9) Yes it has gotten worse. The process is fine in that we cannot avoid laying out a plan for a study. It has also gotten worse from our trying to make definite statements of what we will do, rather than letting the discovery process guide us in what is the best and most appropriate solution to the research problem. When we are limited by an up-front statement of what we will do, we lose out on the ability to let discovery guide us with what should be done.

**What factors would lead to an improvement in the planning process, and how do these factors relate to PSPs?**

1) Not sure

- 2) Our customers would be very happy if the COE would see the PSP as a contract and that new requirements/changes in policy were undertaken at 100% federal cost.
- 3) I believe we could eliminate the Recon phase and still maintain the general ability to perform studies for projects that are deemed of national significance. For example, I see us only having the feasibility study and in the initial stages we would determine if the proposed project is of national significance. If so, we would proceed with the feasibility study. This would certainly reduce the cost involved with conducting studies that are of national interest.
- 4) Open communication must be adopted and is usually lacking among offices. Each design team member must be able to feel free that they can make decisions and not feel great repercussion if things beyond their control go wrong.
- 5) We need a study manager who provides the leadership to pull the team members and the sponsor together. The study manger needs to explain what is required, especially with more complex issues such as incremental analysis and NED.
- 6) Not sure.
- 7) Training and education of people who develop PSPs would be beneficial. Especially the study manager so they truly understand the philosophy behind the PSP and what is required of them.
- 8) HQ is attempting to revamp the planning process. Although this could be a good thing, too often the policies developed by personnel at HQ do not consider the work that is actually performed in the field. In addition, when policy is changed at HQ, plans that we are currently working on are not grandfathered and this forces us to revamp the PSP.
- 9) What a PSP needs to address is an understanding of the study site, develop ways to address the study, and alternatives to investigate.

Q14. Are there particularly good or bad experiences that you have had with PSPs that you would like to discuss? Were your experiences related to the difficulty/complexity of the project or attributed to the PSP alone?

**Are there particularly good or bad experiences that you have had with PSPs that you would like to discuss?**

1) My experience with PSPs is limited to a few cases. The biggest problem is planning studies are an evolving process and we can't predict what will always occur. We make assumptions for the study and when assumptions generated for an initial phase of the study change, latter phases also have corresponding changes due to changes in the initial phase. Thus, it is more difficult to generate what will occur in the latter stages of feasibility and flexibility with scheduling and funding needs to be recognized.

2) The bad experiences relate to getting everyone to agree to the study needs. This varies by the sponsor, district, and division/HQ arrangement. The opinion of people also matters. When the PSP is flexible, though, this would increase the favorableness of the PSP.

3) The biggest problem I have with PSPs is they tend not to be part of a project management plan. They may separate the planning process from the rest of the process. The PSP was developed as a tool to assist the feasibility, not as a stand alone plan that is used by higher ups to review us. Also, I liked the term IPMP better than PSP. The PSP should be used as a tool for solving a problem.

4) None come to mind.

5) Not really, I am not involved with evaluating how well we did since I am in a technical area.

6) I have yet to have a good experience. All PSPs have been negative. It is a nightmare to negotiate PSPs in the district when half view PSP as the gospel to follow and the other half view them as a requirement for addressing how to conduct the study.

7) On the bad side, the PSP is hard to keep updated and current. On the plus side, the PSP has helped to get the work done in some cases.

8) I find that a quality PSP takes approximately \$30,000 and 3-4 months to complete. The PSP has been helpful for documenting what we will do and who will do what. It reduces future problems and has been a vast improvement over the past.

9) We tend to use a generic PSP as a guide for developing a PSP.

10) No good experiences with PSP to date. I have had total frustration when so many players are involved in the process. We did plans of study in the past and these were used by the study manager as a roadmap to follow and this approach worked well. We now have numerous people looking over our shoulder and HQ wants more detail than is needed before they have buy-in.

Also, the process allows the sponsor to argue the detail to a minute scale were they could possibly argue the level of time required for performing each task.

11) The overall process is frustrating when we spend time developing a document such as the PSP and are then not able to use it since it become outdated.

12) From my experience, the funds that are available for developing a PSP are not always appropriated in sufficient amounts up-front and this causes insufficient funds for the Recon phase. Also, the time for development of the PSP is also limited from the requirement to complete the Recon phase within 12 months.

13) Nothing really stands out. The general trend I have experienced is the iterative review process with PSPs is not positive. We had similar problems even before PSPs were developed.

14) The PSP is developed by the planning study manager who has been involved with the project from its start. As the feasibility phase is entered, the life cycle project manager takes control of the study. This takes away ownership from the study manager and gives it to the project manager. this "shift" in ownership is very confusing to the sponsor and study team. The sponsor must have confidence in the Corps, who is represented by the study manager, if they are going to invest in a cost shared feasibility study. Let me put it this way. We know General Schwarkopf did a hell of a job setting up desert shield. What would have happened if Powell called in Arnold Schwarzenaeger to execute desert storm? We are trying to change horses in mid stream.

15) My experiences with PSPs have been favorable and the PSP has been a tool to use when deviations at feasibility are needed. For example, in two different projects, dollar amounts needed to do a project changed and the PSP helped because the assumptions were documented.

16) I had a bad experience with the last few. The detail that HQ wanted was excessive in that they wanted the exact number of GSs that will be performing work and exactly when they will be doing it. Rather than a general outline of what will be done and the sequence of events that are needed to complete the study.

17) Currently, the sponsor is overwhelmed by the technical data and information that is included in the PSP.

18) The main problem I have experienced with PSPs is the lack of flexibility in the PSP. We currently have little flexibility to make adjustments under a tight schedule if we get bad data (i.e., bad set of surveys). We are left with 2 choices, either get new surveys under a tight schedule or take the blame for bad surveys or missing the previously developed schedule. It is the local sponsor or a contractor who is usually responsible for the problems. The local sponsor often changes their mind in regard to what they want and contractors may do an inadequate job.

19) A few years ago we developed a PSP for a project that involved a local sponsor that was very experienced with engineering. They see us as a top heavy management organization and all we could say was you are right. We did not have the flexibility that would allow us to remove ourselves from the many management levels.

20) Our first PSP was difficult to develop since we had few resources available on how to develop it (i.e., an example PSP). Thus it was difficult to know where we were going with the PSP. From a success standpoint, a recent PSP we developed was a team effort and this tremendously helped the process. Teamwork is vital for a successful PSP.

21) The bad experiences relate to the actual cost of feasibility as outlined in the PSP increased 2 to 3 times the estimated cost for the feasibility study. It is tough to explain to the cost sharing sponsor that the costs have increased by 2 to 3 times from estimated costs.

22) During a study involving the Columbia River channel deepening, there was too much meddling on the part of higher ups. It should be left to the district and the local sponsor to decide how to accomplish the feasibility study.

23) A bad experience was our first PSP we developed. We lacked the necessary experience with how to develop the PSP. A favorable experience was the most recent PSP we developed. We had a team effort into the development of the PSP. Each technical area developed the portion of the PSP that pertained to their area. Additionally, we did an excellent job during the Recon stage and this helped with the PSP development. Additionally, it appears that the divisions are getting out of the PSP and this would eliminate conflicting reviews that have occurred in the past between division and headquarters.

24) The biggest negative experience I have had has been with trying to get coordination. The development of the PSP is easy. Getting HQ and the Division to understand the project is more difficult.

25) Nothing either way.

26) Finding the proper level of detail to include in the PSP without driving PSP development costs up, and having enough detail to effectively guide feasibility.

27) I like them and PSPs have been good for me. PSPs along with the Sure Track software have helped people to better anticipate the needs of others.

28) I have had a mix of good and bad experiences, but overall I have a positive outlook with PSPs. Options or alternatives that were documented in the PSP made the process easier by capturing the uncertainties.

29) In the Reelfoot study we did not have the experience to develop a PSP that meet the initial satisfaction of HQ. More detail was wanted by HQ.

30) The biggest concern I have is that we have a number of personnel who are relatively new and they have a limited experience in developing PSPs. However, they do try to ask questions frequently when unsure how to develop portions of the PSP. Another concern deals with the level of detail we currently put in a PSP. Detail above what is needed to guide feasibility only gives the sponsor the opportunity to question this micro-detail.

31) No comment at this time.

32) The channel deepening study was a negative experience in that it took 3 years to get the PSP finalized. One problem was that we had different areas working in a vacuum and their costs estimates were very high. In addition, the negotiation of the dollars required for the study along with the required detail was time consuming.

33) A bad experience I have encountered is that some people do not use the PSP effectively. They put the PSP in their file after completed and do not use it for the intent it was developed for.

34) I have not had enough experience yet to make a meaningful statement.

35) A bad experience was when a project manager wanted a cost estimate to do a PSP. We provided a gross estimate that was unacceptable to the PM. The PM's solution was to meet and discuss how we would develop a cost estimate for developing the cost estimate of the PSP. Thus by the end, we needed a cost estimate for a cost estimate for a cost estimate. This just defeats the purpose of the PSP, a tool to guide the study process.

**Were your experiences related to the difficulty/complexity of the project or attributed to the PSP alone?**

1) From my experience with PSPs, the concept of scope forces us to determine what needs to be done up-front. However, additional money is spent on the reformulation of PSPs due to changes. This is a cumbersome, but needed aspect of planning. Additionally, the logistics of getting HQ and sponsor approval of a reformulated PSP is problematic and costs money.

2) The project is the factor that relates to my experiences. A good plan is a good idea just so we do not commit ourselves to stop working on a task when dollars allocated for the task in the PSP run out.

3) My experiences are related to the PSP. The PSP is a nuisance at worst and an aid at best. It should be used for defining the problem and setting the steps in obtaining a solution.

4) None come to mind.

5) Not sure

6) Primarily it is with the PSP alone. The Corps has completed difficult projects in the past. It is difficult to meet the schedule outlined in the PSP and other things surrounding the PSP. In addition, HQ wants more information in the PSP than they need to know in assessing if we will be able to complete the study.

7) The PSP alone.

8) I believe the complexity of the project was made manageable by the development of a PSP. I use it almost daily.

9) Not sure

10) My experience relates to the difficulty and complexity of the project, primarily with the level of detail that is required in the PSP.

11) The PSP process is the reason.

12) The project itself causes problems. For example, the local sponsor needs, study type, and political realities are all reasons why a study goes the way it does. A PSP, however, is a way to identify the potential problems and to deliver the product as intended.

13) The problem is not attributed to the PSP, but rather the iterative process for getting approval for a study plan such as a PSP. There has been a reduction in this problem since districts took over technical review.

14) This relates to both.

15) The difficulty and complexity of the project.

16) It was with the PSP alone and the level of detail required. The development of a PSP is becoming as great a task as the Recon report. In addition, it now takes months to redo a PSP in accordance with the comments on the part of HQ.

17) It relates to the PSP since the sponsor has had previous experience with the project. The current study is the flood control portion and they had experience with the previous basin study work.

18) Most have involved the project itself. The local sponsors often change their mind. In addition, when a new local administration occurs while a project is under way, this may affect what they want.

19) In one of our first experiences with a PSP, the local sponsor was knowledgeable and was concerned with the cost of the study due to multiple management levels. In the past when we paid 100 percent of the cost for feasibility, the local sponsor did not care about the cost. Since the sponsor now pays 50 percent of the cost, they have a stake in reducing the cost of feasibility.

20) The complexity of the project is the primary reason. The PSP needs to be flexible and able to adjust according to findings from feasibility.

21) The PSP is the primary cause, especially when we have vast information on costs and hours and little information describing the big picture of the study (i.e., the whys and hows).

22) The problems have been related to the project.

23) Partially it deals with the project itself. When the Recon stage is performed well, the resulting PSP will be well developed. A poor Recon stage results in too much guessing in the PSP.

24) The most difficult part has been with the coordination between HQ, division, and the district. Some unique projects have also been difficult and frustrating just because they were new experiences for us and the Corps and the learning curve caused the frustration.

25) No response

26) The complexity of the project was the overall factor of my PSP experience with developing PSPs. The WBS could possibly be simplified, or the guidance could be enhanced, and/or examples provided of typical WBS.

27) The PSP forces us to determine what is needed to get done. It also captures items that were not foreseen in the Recon phase. The revision of PSPs and the reallocation of dollars are the most difficult components.

28) An unfavorable experience was not due to the PSP, but rather due to an initial funding constraints when the PSP was developed. Eventually, additional dollars were needed and obtained to complete the study.

29) The PSP alone was the contributing factor. We are moving into environmental restoration work which is new to us. In the PSP, HQ wanted us to specify exact models to use in the study and the expected results, along with how we will evaluate the study. The level of detail they wanted for the PSP in these areas was the detail we could only find out about as we performed the feasibility phase.

30) The past relationships we have had with the sponsor is an influence on the project. Sponsors from smaller communities tend to question the detail of the PSP. Meanwhile, sponsors from larger communities tend to question the methods we use

31) No comment at this time.

32) The complexity of the project is an overall factor along with the funding capability of the sponsor and what the sponsor wants to do. It can be a difficult process with the sponsor. The PSP is a roadmap for us to follow.

33) The PSP alone is the primary reason in that it currently requires too much detail. It tends to turn people off, especially when change occurs during the middle of a study. Education is the key to improving the use of PSPs.

34) From my experience it appears the project is the significant factor.

35) Related to the lack of experience of the project manager in regard to how and what to manage.

Q15. What do you believe is required to develop a quality and worthwhile PSP? Are these elements currently available? How does this correspond to official guidance and what is expected of you?

**What do you believe is required to develop a quality and worthwhile PSP?**

1) A big picture understanding of why we are developing PSPs is needed. A method to develop reliable estimates of costs so we can reduce the amount of resources we build into a study due to contingencies would be helpful. A training course may be an acceptable forum to address these concerns. Experience is also vital for developing effective PSPs (i.e., as we develop more PSPs, we should become better with the process).

2) Communication is the key. The study manager or project manager gets a strawman PSP going with input from the technical areas. The PSP is then reviewed/discussed with the sponsor. It takes time to develop a PSP especially when opinions enter the picture.

3) The PSP should address the needs of the team to accomplish the tasks leading to the product. Thus information included in the PSP beyond what is needed to guide the study makes the PSP no longer useful.

4) An experienced study manager is key and must believe in the usefulness of the PSP, will use the PSP once produced, and must bring other key players into the development of the PSP to make the PSP worthwhile.

5) The main thing is not to be so specific. We need some generality of what we will do but we do not need to nail everything down in the PSP. Identify things in broad categories with less detail.

6) First, additional guidance on what exactly HQ wants is needed. 2) A review is needed of the technical requirements for a project in light of the requirements that HQ specifies. For example, HQ wants more detail included in a PSP, in contrast to the requirement to get a project done less expensively and quicker. 3) Issues that could impact the PSP need to be resolved earlier in the Recon phase. 4) Districts need to have greater authority over the PSP. 5) The project manager needs strengthened authority or else totally eliminate this position. Otherwise, a project manager without authority is like “the bark from a toothless dog”. 6) We also need to recognize that factors beyond are control will occur (i.e., status of flood control policy as developed from elected officials).

7) An understanding of the major elements that bring about the product is needed. For example, we need to identify major decision points in a logical manner, methods to track the accomplishment of these decision points, and we need to outline the process of who depends on who or what.

8) Input from all team members, \$30,000, up to 6 months to complete, and 3-4 go rounds among team members with a draft PSP are needed.

- 9) The expertise level of the study manager and technical manager is most important for a PSP.
- 10) It would be beneficial to have examples of excellent PSPs that we could use as a model. The sharing of lessons learned in other districts would also be helpful.
- 11) We need to reduce the time required to complete the PSP and the time used for the review process. At the district and division level we have now gotten the process down to typically one review only. However, this time frame still takes more time than is desirable.
- 12) The level of detail in regard to the size of the study are a concern. The amount of review needs to be decreased. PSP approval should occur at the district level. The language in EC-1105-2-208 is inconsistent with what was taught in the Project Management Prospect Course.
- 13) The study manager and/or project manager need to have the expertise to use a PSP. We have many new personnel in the district. The inexperience on part of the SM/PM increases the iterations needed to develop a PSP. Perhaps, training these individuals in general planning principles and/or development of a PSP would help. The trend has been for the SM/PM to use a previous PSP to guide them in developing a PSP for a new project. They basically change the numbers in the previous PSP. We have had some problems with this in that the PSP they selected was not similar enough to the current situation. A boiler plate PSP may help.
- 14) The leadership must stay with the planning element. Thus a shift to program management should not occur until the end of the feasibility phase.
- 15) A quality and worthwhile PSP is developed primarily from experience. Completing a PSP from scratch with little experience would be difficult. Experience within the district and being able to tap experience in other districts and divisions is of more importance to the technical elements. Courses may be beneficial for the team leaders who have to coordinate total project times and costs with sponsors.
- 16) The guidance needs to be simplified and only basic requirements need to be addressed in a PSP. In reality, we only need to lay out the framework of how to approach a study and all need to agree on the scope. This is a must to work with others.
- 17) We need a clear understanding of the end-product and the alternatives we will investigate.
- 18) Initially a team needs to be assembled and they need to know what the project is about, what is required, and the responsibilities of people. An organizational structure helps. A lack of communication up-front causes problems later. Also, up-front communication with the sponsor helps alleviate future problems. In the past we had the local sponsor become involved near the end of the process and we were not totally aligned with what the local sponsor wanted.
- 19) Additional time and money to complete the PSP. Also, greater oversight on part of upper management since they have seen similar studies before. Upper management must also realize what it takes to complete a study or we must be able to inform them of the true needs to complete feasibility. For example, in a current project we anticipated it would take 5 years to complete

feasibility and upper management thought it should only take us 3 years. We are now into the third year of the study and likely will need 2 additional years.

20) Strong leadership on part of the study manager and/or project manager is important. The PSP needs to be developed by a team to make it successful. An emphasis in completing the PSP as early in the process as possible is important. It also needs to be kept updated.

21) The PSP should contain more information describing what we will do, why we will do it, and how we will complete the feasibility study. The PSP implies the cost is well defined and low risk for change. This not good in light of costs increasing from estimated costs. We should provide a range of costs likely to be incurred in the feasibility study, rather approximate close estimates for the work items involved with each task.

22) We need adequate time and money to develop a PSP. In addition, there needs to be a connection between program and planning when PSPs are developed. For example, during our last study, program took money for slippage and also increased the time frame of the study. We need to have program involved to bring these issues to the table while the PSP is being developed.

23) A team effort where all parties are well coordinated and have a say in the PSP. When the study manager or project manager has most of the say, the PSP is not worthwhile.

24) A teamwork approach is most important, from HQ to the staff working on the study. We must all work toward the same goal, completing the study and project effectively and efficiently. We currently seem to have our own goal to achieve. For example, HQ has a budgetary goal, division has a policy goal, and the district has a technical goal. These multiple goals cause a problem. A common goal is taught in leadership training. A philosophy seems to follow where HQ thinks the division works for them and the division thinks the district works for them. In contrast, we should use the philosophy were HQ and the division are there to help the district get their job done.

25) A technical or project manager that is knowledgeable of the planning process is a must. Sample PSPs that were reviewed by HQ and approved with few revisions and when the study progressed favorably as a result of the PSP.

26) Clear and concise guidance is needed. Current guidance does not address the level of complexity that is required. The experience with PSP development also is a factor. A training course and good examples would also be beneficial.

27) We need people who can see the big picture and focus down to the detail. They must also be highly interested in the study.

28) A good work description describing schedule and its link to activity, target completion date, dollars required, and the organization or district that will do the work. A training session, possibly short term (i.e., few hours to a day) could be useful to see other examples of PSPs and what others are doing.

29) A coordinated effort on the part of all disciplines is required to identify from the scope and reconnaissance what to do and specific activities to address. The PSP should be a brief description of this and be regarded as a living document or tool. It can be a good tool to monitor and track our effectiveness.

30) The study team must understand what they want to accomplish. We must also limit the number of alternatives we study. Education of the sponsor is also important. They must be educated in what is needed and why we will do various tasks.

31) Communication between the participants of the study and experienced team members.

32) A committed team who will work out the issues, time line, and put it on paper is vital. Product input/output among the stakeholders is also important. Teamwork is a must to get the buy-in of all parties.

33) The three elements that I mentioned previously, schedule, budget, and quality, are important parts of the PSP. Policy issues also need to be addressed.

34) The scope in the PSP should be written in the sense that if given to a contractor, the work would be done. In addition, only cost and schedule are of importance in the PSP.

35) What is needed is a good understanding of the study area, what is already known, and what needs further investigation to answer the study questions. Further, a schedule, budget, assumptions listing the end product as expected, and what requirements are to be met on the part of the sponsor and other agencies.

**Are these elements currently available?**

1) Not sure

2) It varies by office, sponsored project, and personnel that work on the project.

3) Yes, the skills of the team are in place. The PSP is used to pull the team together in a common direction.

4) No response

5) Not sure

6) It is available. Someone just needs to define what the PSP is. Is the PSP a contract or guide. If a contract, with who and it must be binding in that it can not be changed in midstream without approval of all parties.

7) Yes

- 8) I have used past PSP examples provided by HQ as a source for developing a PSP. This is very vital when new personnel are developing their first PSP.
- 9) I believe the expertise level in our area is available.
- 10) We have asked for copies of excellent PSPs in the past and HQ's response was each project is different.
- 11) No, more timely input from the managers is needed.
- 12) The PSP was touched upon in the Civil Works orientation course, but not in great detail.
- 13) Yes, HQ probably has examples of excellent of PSPs.
- 14) No, we must power-down the leadership that is intimately aware of the publics (sponsor) need. We must empower those that are closest to the problems with the tools and authorities to provide public services.
- 15) Not sure
- 16) No. The PSP requirements go beyond the basic idea of what is needed in a PSP.
- 17) No. The study manger and district must come up with the problem and solution(s) (i.e., the objectives for the end-product).
- 18) Yes. We are now having local sponsor involvement up-front.
- 19) They are available. We need to inform upper management of the correct amount of resources to complete a study.
- 20) They are available to different degrees. There has been a trend towards emphasis on teamwork. We are also getting better as we gain experience with developing PSPs.
- 21) No since we currently provide vast information on costs and hours involved with a study, rather than a description of the study approach that the sponsor can understand.
- 22) No.
- 23) This depends on the study manager. We are improving as we go along and are developing PSPs as a team. However, some study managers are stuck in their ways.
- 24) They are available. We just need to change the philosophy of the old boy attitude were all work is done for the supervisor.
- 25) I have a sample PSP that I have used.

26) Not sure if a training course is currently offered.

27) If the study manager is on the ball, they provide the leadership needed. Also, the technical managers need to make sure the detail gets done, such as the schedule is addressed.

28) Not sure

29) Yes, over the last few years we have moved into developing a PSP as a combined effort on part of all disciplines.

30) Yes/no. We have many relatively new study managers.

31) Sometimes

32) This varies by the team dynamics for a study. A team at the district that is dedicated to work on the whole study process is beneficial. The districts appear to be moving to this approach.

33) Yes

34) Yes. We know how to do it. We just need personnel to apply the knowhow.

35) Yes they are

**How does this correspond to official guidance and what is expected of you?**

1) I have a mixed opinion about this. We need flexibility with some studies in developing the format of the PSP. While, a formal cookbook is a nice convenience for developing PSPs and would reduce the legwork on our part. A automated system would also help. We could possibly develop more flexible PSPs for smaller cost projects and have a more formal approach for studies that are in excess of a set amount.

2) I have sent both highly detailed PSPs and PSPs that had a minimum of detail to HQ/division for review. The reviews have been similar for the PSPs developed at both extremes of detail level included, minimal changes were needed. The bottom line as I see it is a PSP should contain the basic tasks along with the resources that are required for the tasks during the study.

3) The guidance and most regulations are okay. They tend to allow us the flexibility needed. The problem arises when individuals start to interpret the guidance and continuing expansion by individuals at higher HQ.

4) I work in a stovepipe providing input for my expertise area and have never seen the official guidance.

5) From guidance the level of detail that is wanted is more than is needed. This may be good for cost accounting, but in the presentation we do not need to be so specific.

- 6) The current guidance is not adequate to do the job. The various forms of guidance are not consistent and there are no standards. Up to 1994, we were judged on the ability to allocate dollars. Now we are graded on the ability to spend money. There is no recognition with the need to carry over money and fiscal years between the federal government and local sponsor(s) is/are not always consistent. This can cause conflict with money availability and the ability to spend during the fiscal year dollars are allocated.
- 7) The guidance needs to be designed to develop the notion of the intent of the PSP, but not how to do a study.
- 8) Current policies in the manual are vague in regard to what is wanted in a PSP. There is much grey area with the level of detail required and we are under HQ scrutiny depending on the reviewer.
- 9) We try to develop a PSP in accordance with what is required for a PSP.
- 10) The official guidance is too general, but appropriately so. What we need is the articulation of what is realistically expected in a PSP.
- 11) Not sure
- 12) The EC 1105-2-208 needs some revision to increase the understanding of the requirements.
- 13) Not sure, I am at a technical level.
- 14) The people who develop the guidance are disconnected from the people doing the work. When the guidance/policy is changed during the middle of a PSP, it must be redone since no change is grand-fathered in.
- 15) Not sure
- 16) We are finding that we are becoming overwhelmed with guidance from HQ. Some of the guidance is convoluted or difficult to understand. It appears that the policy writers are able to keep us inundated with more policies than we are able to attend to. This tends to make a loop where we receive policy faster than we are able to deal with it.
- 17) Clearer guidance would help a better PSP be developed. The interpretation of the PSP guidance may differ among the district, division, and HQ. HQ should be more flexible in assisting the district during development of a PSP. In the past HQ has not provided adequate support or been as helpful as they could have been. They have been much too critical and have not viewed the PSP from the district's perspective.
- 18) We try to follow what is in the official guidance. However, what is in the guidance is not what the local sponsor always wants to hear. We explain to the local sponsor what we can do and what we cannot do.

- 19) It is compatible with the spirit of written guidance. With downward pressure the study is not always implemented as it should be.
- 20) The guidance is not bad, but we have tended to go our own way with the development of a PSP depending on the project.
- 21) Current guidance wants fine and finite detail with costs and hours involved with the study. We have the biggest problems with HQ when we deal with policy issues and when HQ lacks an understanding of the scope of work.
- 22) The dichotomous emphasis of spending resources to develop a PSP during times of declining resources is inconsistent.
- 23) I haven't ever seen official guidance from HQ.
- 24) The guidance is often interpreted in the review position in terms of a requirement, rather than a suggested way to develop a PSP. The goal of the PSP is less important than how we should do the study .
- 25) I used an old IPMP as a guide to develop a PSP. However, the division believed the PSP was inadequate and sent the PSP back for revision along with a sample PSP. When I sent back the revised PSP, I received little feedback on it.
- 26) We have guidance that is provided, but once again the level of detail that is needed for the WBS is unclear. It appears that the PSP is similar to the IPMP, but the level of detail required has increased. This is contrary to the emphasis of making studies less complex and taking less time to prepare in a time of decreasing budgets and available manpower to do the work.
- 27) The official guidance appears to be fine. However, I believe QA/QC needs to be addressed with the current requirement for QC plans to be addressed in the PSP for quality assurance. I believe that the first QC plans developed will have some bugs that will be worked out as our experience with developing them improves.
- 28) We are currently doing what is required.
- 29) More guidance is not needed. We may read more into the guidance than is actually required of us. All studies are different and the needs for a study vary. A cookbook for producing a PSP is not the best way to go since many projects are unique.
- 30) The only guidance I have seen was cursory information of what to include in the PSP. We need to have previous examples of PSPs that would lay the framework of the level of detail that is required in a PSP.
- 31) The PSP is suggested/required to be done for the feasibility study but the PSP is not enforced. Also, the district decides what resources it is willing to provide for the process.

32) The guidance HQ has provided appears to be adequate and their examples that they have provided have been helpful. Papers that have been written about the PSP process have also been useful. It appears to me that some districts believe that the PSP process is just a requirement to make work, rather than the PSP being a roadmap to follow. In general, the PSP forms the who, what, why, where, when, and how.

33) The current guidance is adequate. The problem with current guidance is that it requires too much detail currently to be addressed in the PSP.

34) The guidance is there.

35) Pretty closely. The guidance is excellent. The problem is how we implement the guidance and the emphasis with compliance. Interpretation is also a problem with the division. They provide us with their interpretation of the guidance. Their interpretation may differ from the interpretation on HQs part.

